THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

What is the boundary of individual personality? Where do 'I' end, and where does the 'not-I' begin? In a physical sense, at least, the modern West can easily answer this question. 'I' end at the surface of my skin. My toes, fingers and hair are all 'me' in a way in which my clothes are not. But the ancient world, and especially the ancient East, found the matter much less simply defined. It did not, for instance, clearly differentiate between 'soul' and 'body'; on the one hand, too, it was apt to ascribe what we should regard as independent personality to parts of the body, while it might also include in the same general entity things and persons which, to our minds, lie quite outside the limits of the individual. As Heraclitus said, 'Though thou shouldest traverse every path, thou couldst not discover the boundaries of "soul"; it hath so deep a meaning.'

With a citation of this dictum Dr. A. R. Johnson closes the first and the last sections of his study on *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (University of Wales Press Board; 2s. net). Short as it is (it was a paper read before the Society for Old Testament Study in 1939) it is a searching and illuminating study of its subject, and provides a basis for further progress which may be profoundly important for religious thinking. Dr. Johnson is familiar with the work of many predecessors, whose views he has grasped and co-ordinated in a way which gives freshness and originality to his presentation, while his own treatment is marked by both insight and close reasoning, based on a wide and thorough acquaintance with the language and literature involved in his work.

The paper falls into three parts. The first is devoted to a study of human personality, and here Dr. Johnson traverses familiar ground. He restates the Hebrew belief in corporate personality, and points out its bearing on the frequent oscillations between singular and plural when a group is in question. Closely allied to this doctrine is that of the 'extensions of personality whereby the agent may be identified in a full sense with the principal.' A messenger is just as much a part of a man as his hand (we may note in passing that Hebrew uses the same verb with both objects—a man 'sends' his hand just as he 'sends' a messenger), and may use either the third person or the first in speaking of his master.

So far Dr. Johnson has followed lines which are widely accepted. He makes his outstanding contribution when he recognizes that Hebrew thought applied the same range of ideas both to the human and to the divine. In other words, there are various 'extensions of the personality' of Yahweh—such are the Spirit, the Word, the Name, the Ark, with the possibility of others.

In the third section of his paper Dr. Johnson takes up the idea of 'corporate personality' and shows how it also applied to the Hebrew conception of the Godhead. The existence of a polytheism in early Israel is indisputable, and there are frequent oscillations between singular and plural in speaking of other deities than Yahweh. Parallels are cited from Accadian religious literature, showing that Israelite thought was by no means unique in this respect. Returning to the Old Testament, Dr. Johnson shows how the Angel of Yahweh, and even the human prophet in moments of inspiration, could be and were identified with Yahweh Himself. Here we have an illustration both of 'corporate personality' and of an 'extension of personality.'

It is difficult to estimate the importance of this line of thought. It may well, however, in days to come exercise a profound influence on our interpretation of the Old Testament conception of the Godhead, and it may help us to see how the Hebrew Bible leads up to the Christian dogma of the Trinity—it may, indeed, help future generations to a restatement of that fundamental truth.

The Rev. Daniel T. Jenkins, M.A., B.D., appears to be right in saying that in modern England there has been a genuine revival of Churchmanship. One has long associated Churchmanship with the 'Catholic Anglicans' of the Church of England. But interest in the doctrine of the Church is becoming widespread not only in

the Church of England but also in the Reformed Churches generally. It is significant that the writer above named is a Congregational minister, and that the book from which we have quoted is entitled *The Nature of Catholicity* (Faber & Faber; 5s. net).

His object is to state the point of view from which Reformed Theology approaches the doctrine of the Church. He discovers the marks of catholicity in the possession of Jesus Christ as He is known through the apostolic testimony in Word and Sacrament, and the bringing of the form of the Church under the judgment of Jesus Christ that His Lordship might be made manifest in it. It may be gathered that in his view the approach of Reformed Theology to the doctrine of the Church is theological rather than historical.

Here are the qualities, eight in number, which he assigns to the Church which is truly catholic. First, it must be one Church, even as Jesus Christ its Lord is one. In this quality of oneness or unity the different branches of the Church in England are lacking. Not only are they divided from each other but they have acquiesced in their divisions and become 'denominational.'

Secondly, a Catholic Church will have universality of appeal. In this quality there is, as compared with the Roman Church, a lamentable lack in modern Protestantism. There was truth in Newman's contrast of the universal appeals of Romanism with the limited and sectarian appeals of the Anglican and Reformed Churches. The Church should always strive to keep local characteristics in their proper place.

Thirdly, a truly Catholic Church will permit nothing in its constitution which hinders it in its obedience to the Word of God. The Church should never allow the State to interfere in its distinctively ecclesiastical actions. In particular, it should assert the right to appoint its own ministers.

Fourthly, a truly Catholic Church will permit nothing in the form of its intellectual life which hinders it from its obedience to its Lord. Here our writer is critical of the 'notorious' Doctrinal Report of the Church of England and also of the Modernist movement.

Fifthly, the Catholic Church will try to grasp for itself and give expression to the whole of the Faith. Here English theology in general, and the Church of England in particular, are taken to task as not having sufficient interest in Dogmatic or Systematic Theology. Until recently at least, lectures on Systematic Theology at Oxford normally meant historical analyses of the teaching of the Fathers.

Sixthly, the Catholic Church will also seek fullness of liturgical life. This does not necessarily mean a formalised service. Indeed 'set forms' are far from being indispensable to worship. It is to be added that this fullness of liturgical life is to be controlled at every point by the Gospel as it is in Scripture; the Liturgy cannot be taken as an excuse for lack of interest in theology.

Seventhly, a truly Catholic Church will regard itself as responsible for forming a Christian pattern of society. The whole of our life in all its parts —including its social and economic and political parts—must be transformed, not conformed to this world. If we take Christ's Lordship seriously, there must be some meaning in the phrases, 'Christian civilisation,' 'Christian culture.'

Finally, the most distinctive of all the qualities of a truly Catholic Church will be its humility. A truly Catholic Church will not be too ready to assert its own catholicity. It is significant that the idea of membership of the Body meant for St. Paul having the 'same mind' which was in Christ Jesus, who 'humbled himself.'

Obviously Mr. Jenkins raises controversial issues, and he does not hesitate to raise them in a controversial spirit. Karl Barth, from whom he quotes freely, appears to have been his chief preceptor.

Mr. C. S. Lewis has established his position as one of the most acute religious thinkers of our time. His treatment of 'The Problem of Pain' is most profound and illuminating, while his recent 'Screwtape Letters' have shown a remarkable degree of originality in psychological analysis and moral insight.

He has now published a double series of *Broadcast Talks* (Centenary Press; 2s. 6d. net), the first dealing with Right and Wrong, the second with What Christians Believe. The book is small but every page and every paragraph in it is packed with matter. Although it is popular in form and not devoid of apt illustrations the argument is too close knit to be grasped at one hearing. Those, therefore, who listened to the talks, as well as all others, will find this book repay the most careful study.

In the first series of talks the main point is

that our sense of right and wrong provides us with a genuine and indeed unique 'clue to the meaning of the universe.' When people dispute together about some line of conduct the one will say to the other, in effect, 'You should have done this,' or 'You shouldn't have done that.' 'Now what interests me about all these remarks is that the man who makes them isn't just saying that the other man's behaviour doesn't happen to please him. He is appealing to some kind of standard of behaviour which he expects the other man to know about. And the other man very seldom replies, "To hell with your standard." Nearly always he tries to make out that what he has been doing doesn't really go against the standard, or that if it does there is some special excuse.'

It would appear, therefore, that both parties to the dispute have a common standard, a rule of fair play or right conduct to which they appeal and by which they are to be judged. This standard is what older thinkers called the Law of Nature, using that term, not as it is now used to denote physical or chemical laws, but in the sense of the Law of *Human* Nature, the law of right conduct somehow implanted in man's constitution and to which he is constrained to do homage. It is true that different civilizations and different ages have given interpretations of that Law which differ in detail, but that does not invalidate the fact that all alike have had that innate sense of obligation from which they can in no wise escape.

Now this is a fundamental fact about ourselves and the universe in which we live. If this Law were merely a convention or an instinct our whole system of morality would become a meaningless thing. 'What is the sense of saying that the enemy is in the wrong unless Right is a real thing which the Germans at bottom know as well as we do and ought to practise? If they had no notion of what we mean by right, then, though we might still have to fight them, we could no more blame them for that than for the colour of their hair.' The concept of progress, also, would be reft of all meaning. For progress is not simply change but change for the better according to an approved standard. We all do, in fact, believe that some ideals are truer and better than others. 'Very well then. The moment you say that one set of moral ideas can be better than another, you are, in fact, measuring them both by a standard, saying that one conforms to that standard more nearly than the other. . . . You are, in fact, comparing them both with some Real Morality, admitting that there is *really* such a thing as Right, independent of what people think.'

Over against this recognition of an absolute standard to which we ought to conform there is an equal recognition of the sad fact that we fail to conform. 'Human beings, all over the earth, have this curious idea that they *ought* to behave in a certain way, and can't really get rid of it. But they don't, in fact, behave in that way. They know the Law of Nature; they break it.' This strange contradiction between the Law of Human Nature and man's failure to conform to it creates a situation which, so far as we know, is absolutely unique. Every other created being is obedient to the law of its nature. As Chesterton has whimsically put it, it would be meaningless to say to a crocodile, 'Be a crocodile,' but we do say, 'Be a man,' implying that the individual thus addressed has failed or may fail to be a man.

Now here we have a valuable clue to the meaning of the universe and of our significance in it. It is a clue with which science cannot deal, for the business of science is to ponder and record what *is*, not what *ought to be*. 'Anyone studying Man from the outside as we study electricity or cabbages, not knowing our language and consequently not able to get any inside knowledge from *us*, but merely observing what he did, would never get the slightest evidence that we had this moral law. How should he? For his observations would only show what we did, and the moral law is about what we ought to do.' But where science is left outside in the dark we by our own inner knowledge of ourselves can follow the clue. And whither does it lead? Does it not suggest that Something or Someone is trying to get at us as an influence or a command to behave in a certain way? It looks as if there is 'a Something which is directing the universe, and which appears in me as a law urging me to do right and making me feel responsible and uncomfortable when I do wrong. I think we have to assume it's more like a mind than it's like anything else we know—because after all the only other thing we know is matter and you can hardly imagine a bit of matter making a law.' We are impelled to conclude that the Being behind the universe is intensely interested in right conduct—in fair play, unselfishness, decency, but we are bound to confess that to these ideals we continually fail to conform. In other words we find ourselves gravely out of tune with the ruling will of the universe.

This is a situation which must be taken seriously. In whatever way it came about it needs to be remedied. And this implies something on man's

part which in religious language would be spoken about as repentance and return. It cannot be denied that such a suggestion is mightily offensive to the modern mind, obsessed as it is by the concept of progress. Modern man has fondly pictured himself as a being who goes forward and for whom there can be no going back. Progress is the supreme and ultimate law. Well, we all want progress. 'But progress means getting nearer to the place where you want to be. And if you've taken a wrong turning, then to go forward does *not* get you any nearer. If you're on the wrong road, progress means doing an about-turn and walking back to the right road; and in that case the man who turns back soonest is the most progressive man. . . . There's nothing progressive about being pig-headed and refusing to admit a mistake. And I think if you look at the present state of the world, it's pretty plain that humanity has been making some big mistake. We're on the wrong road. And if that is so, we must go back. Going *back* is the quickest way on.'

These things are the prolegomena to Christianity. It is in dealing with this situation that the Christian faith finds its *raison d'être*. It bids men repent and promises forgiveness. 'It therefore has nothing to say to people who don't know they've done anything to repent of and who don't feel that they need any forgiveness. It's after you've realized that there is a real Moral Law, and a Power behind the law, and that you have broken that law and put yourself wrong with that Power—it's *after* all that that Christianity begins to speak.' What that speech is—how it explains the situation which has arisen, and what remedy it offers—are matters which are dealt with in the second broadcast in Mr. Lewis's own clear and incisive way. We commend his little book as a mighty stimulus to faith.

The Rev. D. R. Davies has followed up his two well-known books, 'On to Orthodoxy' and 'The Two Humanities,' by a third, *Secular Illusion or Christian Realism?* (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 3s. 6d. net). The secular illusion is, of course, the assumption of humanism in its various forms, capitalist, Marxian and scientific, that human nature is sufficient to meet all its needs and solve all its problems. It takes three main forms—first, the social, that man has the power to create Utopia here on earth; second, the psychological, that by means of psychoanalysis it is possible to change the condition of the human soul; and third, the moral or spiritual, that by educational progress man's sense of guilt can be eradicated.

This is an illusion, for, so far from any improvement having taken place in man's condition, things have been steadily getting worse. War has become a normal feature of life. Social progress has meant just a change in the form of evils. The advantages of modern times, like education and broadcasting, have been perverted to false ends. And, most emphatic of all is the awful power of the few over the many. The possibilities of radiolocation, for example, are ghastly. From it may come the death-ray. As we can photograph by wireless, we shall be able to kill by wireless. The Satanic fantasy, in which the pressure of a button can destroy towns thousands of miles off, is already on the way.

These are some of the points in Mr. Davies' exposure of the hollowness of the humanist claim for man. And from this he turns to Christian realism which is the doctrine of original sin. This, he says, is a far better guide in dealing with human problems than the facile humanist optimism. It is the *raison d'être* of Christianity. Man's independence of God is the real explanation of the evils in history. Man, gifted with the power of self-determinism (the 'image of God'), has asserted his will against the will of God. And from this has flowed the progressive deterioration of man's condition. The plain truth is that all our social problems are theological in character. To continue thinking of change in economic system or political structure as fundamental will be a flimsy defence against the demon of unredeemed human will.

The only radical solution of the human problem, therefore, is regeneration. What man is unable to do himself, God has achieved for him through Christ. In His life and redeeming death there emerges into history a new humanity whose source of action—whose centre—is not self-will but God. In Him is the new root of historic, social action. This, and nothing less, is the message of the Christian faith to the world. But Mr. Davies makes a curious admission here. This solution of the human problem cannot be completely effective until every single human being has been incorporated in Christ, remade in His new humanity.

'Everybody a Christian! From the Pope to Hitler, from Karl Barth to H. G. Wells. From the hardest-faced international financier to the softest-hearted vegetarian. From the thickest-skinned Marxist to the thinnest-skinned Pacifist. From the most joyfully pessimistic believer in human corruption to the most wistful Anglican latitudinarian.' Without this society can never be really Christian. But that hope is empty. It is not a

possibility. A radical cure for society is not a historic possibility. Does that mean, then, that Christianity has no social application? What possible relevance can the Christian hope of a redeemed world have in our actual social situation? Much, both negatively and positively.

Negatively, for the realization of what Christianity really is in terms of society will act as a permanent conscience in the world. It will save society from mistaking a superficial make-shift for the real thing. And, as history shows, this is a real danger. The confusing of sub-Christian action with Christian ethic has produced disaster, as the easy optimism of Victorian England demonstrates.

But positively also, for, as Christ taught, the Kingdom of God is present and active in the world. And this Kingdom is concentrated in a society, the Church, which is the only society that even pretends to initiate its action from the will of God. The Church is not the Kingdom. But in spite of her infidelities, she is the shell within which the Kingdom, the new humanity, is taking shape in history for a destiny and fulfilment beyond history. The solution of the human problem, then, is not through isolated individuals but through the Church. Individuals must become Christian, not as atomic, self-existing beings, but rather as cells or organs of a community.

'Individuals must indeed become Christian.' Mr. DAVIES calls this 'the supreme necessity in the present situation.' The world needs more and more Christianized persons. But what does that mean? What is it to become a Christian? It is, first, to realize that the supremacy of his own will is the root of all sin against God, and, second, that he should desire, with his whole being, to abandon that supremacy in favour of the supremacy of the will of God as the new source of life and being. For this the Church is an absolute necessity, as it furnishes alike the truth, the discipline and the fellowship necessary to salvation. And so Mr. DAVIES comes back to his main contention: if the world is to be redeemed the secularist mentality which has ruled it must be abandoned, and the way of salvation sought in the gospel as that is ministered in and through the Church.

George Adam Smith.

BY STANLEY COOK, LITT.D., F.B.A., EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CAMBRIDGE.

WITH the death on 3rd March 1942, at the advanced age of eighty-six, of the Rev. Sir George Adam Smith, there passed away the *doyen* of British Old Testament scholars, and one who had won for himself a permanent niche in the field of Biblical studies. Renowned as a preacher, expositor, and commentator, he was the outstanding authority on the geography and topography of Palestine. He was also a capable administrator, a realist where social and political questions were involved, and not least of all an admirable companion and host. Though not particularly distinguished as a student at Edinburgh he made his mark early, and in his twenty-fourth year was chosen to take over the Hebrew duties in Aberdeen vacated when Robertson Smith resigned in 1880. As minister of Queen's Cross Free Church, Aberdeen (1882–92) he was particularly successful. In 1892 he left Aberdeen to become Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature, and Theology in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, where he remained seventeen years in spite of calls to other cities and countries. In 1909 he returned to Aberdeen as Vice-Chancellor and Principal of the University; and there he remained until his retirement in 1935. A Fellow of the British Academy, Sir G. A. Smith—he was knighted in 1916—was the recipient of many Honorary Degrees and other honours. His was a singularly active and versatile life until old age and increasing weakness claimed their due; and were this the appropriate place much more would have to be said, of course, of a biographical nature. The following paragraphs, however, will be devoted to the literary work of G.A.S.—to use the familiar initials—and his position as a scholar; for not only will he be remembered for his many contributions to Biblical studies, but he belongs, with A. B. Davidson and Robertson Smith, to that great Scottish triad who mark an epoch in this field of research by their ability to carry their contemporaries with them over the gulf that severs earlier 'pre-critical' Old Testament studies and the attitude and spirit that subsequently came to prevail.

Than G.A.S. himself no more eloquent and arresting master of vivid language can scarcely be named among Old Testament scholars. Direct

and inspiring when in the pulpit, he could give life and incisiveness to his words. He brought the Old Testament home to laymen and students alike; and its figures—notably Isaiah, whom he seemed to comprehend more fully than the rest—he clad with flesh and blood. One saw through their eyes, and could grasp the situations they had to face. In his *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* he painted the scenery before us, and the well-known sites stood forth in all their topographical and historical context. Who is there that cannot picture Judæa, its natives with 'the sense of living next door to doom; the sense of how narrow is the border between life and death; the awe of the power of God'? Or one recalls the sketch of the history of Bethshan, the fiery traditions of the plain of Jezreel, and the charm of Galilee. At the same time the needs of the Biblical student and the Hebraist were fully met. Here and elsewhere he showed a fine grasp of the significance of Palestine through all its chequered religious, social, economic, and political vicissitudes. As everyone knows, the epoch-making *HGHL* was used, so to say, as a military handbook in the Palestinian campaigns of 1914–18, for G.A.S. had the soldier's eye for the facts and the possibilities of the terrain.

It is not surprising that one so gifted as he was with a keen sense of the music of words should excel when he came to handle Old Testament poetry and rhythmical prose; and both the Hebrew student and the reader alert to the literary beauty of the Bible have profited from his writings. His 'Schweich Lectures' on *The Early Poetry of Israel in its Physical and Social Origins* (1912) should be especially mentioned. Throughout he was far from being merely an erudite antiquarian; and while any intelligent reader of to-day can find much in ancient Palestinian and other history which his experiences of these hectic years enable him to illuminate and appreciate more vividly than could his forefathers, G.A.S. was pre-eminently one who could find in the past much that bore upon and illuminated the present. In fact, he 'modernized' the Old Testament, particularly the prophets; and for this he did not escape criticism and blame. Yet this attention to the reciprocal relations between similar conditions and situations of the present day and the distant past is one that, though naturally open to abuse, can and should be pursued and extended more fully than ever he did. He was, in truth, the combination of preacher and teacher that is more needed now even than when he wrote.

An early interest in the science of economics—if, indeed, it be a science—and a first-hand acquaintance with the lot of the poor and of the weak in his social activities—where he was splendidly assisted by his wife—added a practical earnestness to his forthright utterances, whether he was expounding the inward significance of a Hebrew prophet's denunciations, or reviving their old-time message in their application to modern circumstances. And though he might appear to treat the old prophets solely as social reformers, throughout it was their theistic or religious background, and not the purely social and economic argument, which he never failed to bring into prominence. He was concrete and practical, rather than theoretical and abstract. He could recognize the factors in human nature that motivated men's deeds, even the worst of them; and he repeatedly stressed the necessity for justice and righteousness and the ill effects of what he more than once styled the 'famine of justice.'

He was no mountain-top idealist. He well knew that religious revivals could have the defects of their qualities, and that the general excitement could destroy in a certain class of minds all sense of facts, corrupt their conscience for accuracy, and give birth to a certain narrowness and exclusiveness. Here he had in mind his experience of Moody's revivals. Moreover, he could declare that the offices of the prophet and of the demagogue are absolutely irreconcilable. A prophet, like Isaiah, was a statesman rather than a politician; and he even says that Isaiah, 'in the largest sense of the expression, is a man of the world—a man of the world because God made the world and rules it' (*Isaiah*, i. 300). Again, he writes 'we have nothing to dread from that fear of kings which once made so many prophets false, but we have all the more to watch that we do not become flatterers of the common people.' If we are to defend their rights, we must be brave to declare their sins. And again, 'by an exaggeration of the liberty and the rights of men of which [our age] is so proud there has never been an age more impatient of personal criticism.' But the prophets had 'their strong conscience of their people's sins and civic duties; this is the harder and the more misunderstood half of patriotism.' Nay more, much as Isaiah may condemn the rulers and leaders of a people, it is the people whom the prophet holds ultimately responsible. To Isaiah a nation's politics are not arbitrary, 'they are the natural outcome of the nation's character; what the people are, that will their politics be . . ., for the greater number of errors committed by their rulers the blame must be laid on the people's own want of character or intelligence.'[1]

[1] *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, 270 f., 306; *Isaiah*, i. 224 f.

If his democracy was a practical faith, his forthrightness manifested itself again in 1914–18. At his death Boston could recall his stirring words on the occasion of his visit to the U.S.A. in 1918: 'To put peace before justice, before honour, before the rescue of the oppressed, before the security of women and children, is to turn Christianity upside down.' Justice, he said, held in her hands a sword as well as a pair of scales: 'the conscience and the faith which do not issue into deeds are imperfect, if not hypocritical, and that these deeds must sometimes, in the name of righteousness, be deeds of war, is a truth which all but the most dogmatic of pacifists have come to acknowledge.' Such was the faith of this sturdy Scotsman, a man with all the fire and fervour of the prophets of Israel whom he understood so well, a man who spoke with a courage, candour, and competence which we miss to-day.

Evangelical fervour is, I think, the distinctive note of G.A.S. It marked his ministry at Aberdeen, his work at Glasgow, and those notable addresses in the U.S.A. which with little change are applicable to these years. Henry Drummond had been his friend from early days, and his fine appreciation of him in his biography of this evangelical man of science (1897) was but another indication that he was a preacher and scholar to a degree unique among professed Biblical critics. His scholarship was that of the great pioneers of his time. Neither he nor William Robertson Smith were theologians as was A. B. Davidson; and while the latter was less prominent than the other members of the triad—though his pupils have borne witness to his inspiring influence—G.A.S. had not the remarkable erudition nor the special scholarly interests that distinguish W.R.S. As an outstanding and remarkably influential scholar W.R.S. stands alone; but G.A.S. was less uncompromising, and could discern more readily and effectively than his senior colleague (who was ten years older than himself) the difficulties of those whom he wished to win over. His scholarship shows itself particularly in his first-hand knowledge of Palestine and in his elaborate and highly stimulating volumes on Jerusalem; and his commentary on Deuteronomy, not to mention a valuable article on 'Trade and Commerce' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, are among other examples that could be quoted of his careful workmanship, and prove that if the preacher is often uppermost in his writings, the preacher had the training, learning, and insight of a scholar. To be sure, much has since been done as regards the many difficult topographical problems of Palestine; Biblical scholarship has not remained where he left it, and various problems —*e.g.* the composition of the books of Isaiah and Deuteronomy, and the identification of the Servant of the Lord—are still *sub judice*.

G.A.S. served his age, and his work will live as a guide and inspiration. He was—and notably in *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament* (1901)—a powerful exponent of the now ruling position in the literary criticism of the Old Testament which is commonly associated with the name of Wellhausen and dates from the seventies and eighties of the last century. Here G.A.S., through his personal knowledge of the land and its actual conditions, was an invaluable leader. He could point out that the fact that a narrative accurately reflects geography does not necessarily mean that it is a real transcript of history, else were the book of Judith the truest man ever wrote, instead of being, what it is, a pretty piece of fiction. Moreover, the alleged refutation of literary criticism by archæology could be dismissed; archæology does indeed illustrate, but it has not one whit of proof to offer for the personal existence or characters of the Patriarchs. He could speak with authority on the transitional stages between pure nomads, semi-nomads, and settlers, and could certify that for all the contact of more or less nomadic tribes with more or less civilized peoples the former do not necessarily learn to read or write: in a word, the fact of the antiquity of writing in and around Palestine in the Mosaic Age does not prove that the early Israelites were literary. The position taken by one with a profound knowledge of Palestine—one which was also the position of W.R.S., S. R. Driver, and others—remains as secure to-day as it was decades ago.

Biblical criticism—urged G.A.S.—so far from injuring the cause of religion had contributed positively to the development of Christianity. But while the great Scottish triad were among those who inaugurated and popularized modern criticism the years have brought deep-reaching changes that are affecting the future development of religion in general and Christianity in particular. It is scarcely possible in the present welter of opposing tendencies and convictions to take so much for granted as could our predecessors. We find ourselves in an age of transition. The developments in research are independent and miscellaneous, centrifugal, and unco-ordinated; one misses the profundity, comprehensiveness, and philosophical spirit of the past. There was an organic unity in the thought of the greater writers, though to be sure you could not necessarily make their religion, or their science, or their specialist knowledge your own. Faith and reason were wedded in a way that seems unattainable for this age of vastly-increased knowledge coupled with its anti-intellectualism and irrationalism.

To take an outstanding example. How could W.R.S., with his penetrating analytical skill and amazing erudition, retain his early religious convictions ? Are we to say, as did one ' rationalist ' admirer, that he was ' at heart unspotted from the world of reason ' ? Even to the end he was anxious to complete the series of Burnett Lectures, of which *Religion of the Semites* was the only one to be published ; he had, we are told, always one dominant idea, ' he longed to be able to " complete his argument." ' [1] And while G.A.S. may be said to have completed his synthesis, and at an early date, W.R.S. did not live to complete his task, and to-day a new and more complete synthesis, taking account of the progress of special studies, is urgently called for.

Taking everything into consideration, I myself do not think that one can find so natural a combination of religion, theology, philosophy, and scholarship as in the work of A. B. Davidson. As for G.A.S., it has been well said that his life-work was ' the objectification of the man ' ; and, as another writer put it, ' he penetrates to the cardinal issue, " the self-evidencing character of truth and its beauty." ' [2] It is pertinent to recall the dictum of A. N. Whitehead : ' self-evidence is the basic fact on which all greatness supports itself,' [3] for it is the intelligible and harmonious interrelation between a man's personal religion, his life, and his fields of intellectual activity which we need to re-establish.

W.R.S. had not the earnest and practical zeal for social and national reform that moved G.A.S., with his reiterated insistence on righteousness and justice. On the other hand, as a scholar the work of W.R.S. in the field of Semitic sociology and social and religious institutions was epoch-making. While Davidson, for his part, emphasized the ' materialness ' of the Old Testament : ideas and truths were concrete in history, in institutions, in men, etc. ; W.R.S., in turn, showed how ' redemption, substitution, purification, atoning blood, the garment of righteousness, are all terms which in some sense go back to antique ritual.' [4] The great principles were embodied in life before they were made explicit and treated in abstraction ; and to-day the issue is a new synthesis of thought and action, of idea and its form, a harmony of the highest spiritual principles and the noblest types of individual, social, and national life. There are many keen reforming and planning aims ; but for their success they need the appropriate forceful and pregnant ideas, and both the scholar and the preacher can contribute to a new synthesis.

W.R.S., as a young theologian, writing on the invisible bond that unites the Church Invisible, the mystic body of Christ, could say that ' every society is bound together by a common aim and common principles ; a [Christian] society must be bound together by its common Christianity.' [5] Later, writing as a Semitic scholar, he stressed the general significance of the social unit, the common life or blood, the unifying religion of the clan or tribe, and the circle of kinsfolk and their gods into which a man was born. And if an *esprit de corps* or corporate spirit can unify any collection of men, the issue to-day is the nature and quality of the unifying Spirit. Again, as a theologian W.R.S. could stress the power of the Sacraments and the *personal* intercourse between God and man ; later, as a scholar, the theory of at-one-ment and communion was the leading motive which made his writings famous. No doubt his theory of totemism demands restatement, and against his special theory of the origin of sacrifice various objections have been brought. But what I consider to be his essential point remains unshaken, namely, the fact, or the idea, or the experience, that inaugurates every new and significant stage in the development of sacrificial ritual. Modern criticism has, it is true, transferred the Levitical sacrificial institutions in their present form from the Mosaic Age to the inauguration of post-exilic Judaism ; so that whereas the canonical history had placed them at the inauguration of Israel's national Yahwism, they are now to be read after the Second Isaiah and the mysterious ' Servant of the Lord.' They follow after Israel's ' rediscovery '—so I would style it—of her God and of her destiny. But W.R.S., in his great classic, *The Prophets of Israel*, did not go down to the exilic and post-exilic periods, and it is to Davidson and G.A.S. that we must turn if we would grasp the spiritual significance of those years in the sixth century B.C. when Israel's religion reached a height to be surpassed only at the rise of Christianity. Thus to a fuller comprehension of unifying spiritual occasions the three scholars powerfully contribute each in his own way.

To-day there prevail ideas of Messianism and divine choice, the saintliness of one figure, the fervent idealism of another, the ruthless passion of a third. How one is carried back to the conditions that lie in and behind the great pregnant periods of the Bible and the problems that had

[1] Citations from the *Life of W.R.S.*, by J. S. Black and G. Chrystal, 572 and 550.

[2] The quotations are from Prof. W. Manson's address at a memorial service (*The Scotsman*, 9th March 1942), and Principal Wheeler Robinson (*The British Weekly*, 12th March).

[3] *Modes of Thought* (1938), 66.

[4] *Religion of the Semites*, 436 ; cf. my note in the third edition, 676 ff.

[5] See *op. cit.*, 504, *n.* 1, 594, and Preface, xxxiv.

then to be faced and fought! In these days of prophets, leaders, and Messiahs, persuasive and powerful enough to command an influential following to carry out their will, the old-time problems arise of distinguishing between the 'true' and the 'false,' between what is truly 'spiritual' and what can only be called 'psychical.'

So, if modern research and present-day events enable us to study the Bible afresh, do we not owe it to the pioneers in general and the triad in particular that we can come back with their conviction, candour, and courage to serve our own history-making age, as they served theirs? It is as true now as when W.R.S. wrote (in 1877) that the first promise of the Reformation has not yet been fulfilled. The Reformation made the old Bible fresh, giving it a new life; and if we in turn are to rediscover that it is inexhaustible, we shall not treat it 'like a sow with a bag of oats,'[1] but as the Book wherein, thanks to modern criticism, we can discover enshrined the record of tremendous epochal events to which this age is the nearest and the next parallel. Here we need alike the scholar and the evangelist, the preacher and the teacher—and the life-history of George Adam Smith is an assurance that there might even be a combination of the four in one.

[1] Luther's reproach to Tetzel, see W.R.S., *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 8.

Literature.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE WORLD CHURCH

This book, *The Old Testament in the World Church*, by Professor Godfrey E. Phillips, M.A. (Lutterworth Press; 10s. net), is written, we are informed, 'with special reference to the Younger Churches' and bears witness to the impetus to Christian thinking furnished by the Tambaram Conference of the International Missionary Council. That Conference asked, in the interest of the Younger Churches, for 'a fresh search into the treasures to be found in the Old Testament.' In the interest of the Older Churches as well such a rediscovery is demanded. A generation ago there did indeed come a vivid realization of the relevance of the books of the Prophets to the social problems of the modern world, but since then the experience of two wars has brought into harsh relief before us the dark aspects of Israel's history and caused some revulsion from them. We in the Older Churches have to make clearer to ourselves why the Old Testament is, and must remain, precious to the Church of Christ, and to study how it can be so presented that 'the precious' in it shall be isolated from the 'vile.'

It may well be of great help to us in our study of this question to place ourselves beside the Younger Churches and understand their problem as it is presented in this book by Professor Phillips. We can see how some African Christians feel that 'the atmosphere of the Old Testament is too much like their own'—in regard to polygamy, for example. We can see, too, how Indians are ready to prefer the gentler mood of their devotional poetry to the fierceness of the imprecatory psalms. The defence of these psalms that Professor Phillips cites from a modern Hebrew scholar (p. 136) does not satisfy one any more than that of our fathers did when they persuaded themselves that the curses were directed against sin and not against the sinners. To illustrate the Chinese view of the Old Testament Professor Phillips quotes a saying of a pastor with which one can fully sympathize. 'Reading the Old Testament,' he said, 'is like eating a large crab; it turns out to be mostly shell with very little meat in it.' What is really needed is that all the churches be helped to discover what the meat in it is and how it is to be found and made use of.

Professor Phillips' argument rests in the main on three values that the Old Testament contributes to religion. (1) It shows us God manifesting Himself in history, the God who is at work there, the living God. (2) It emphasizes in God 'the terrible, the inscrutable, the awful,' while at the same time He is merciful and gracious. (3) It provides us with 'the opening part of the story of the world's salvation through Christ.' Each of these truths that the Old Testament enshrines is fundamental to Christianity and to deprive Christianity of any one of the three is to do it fatal injury. Does that mean then that the religious heritage of the non-Christian peoples has no place in the religion of the Younger Churches, that they must cast it all as rubbish to the void?

That does not follow. If these three guiding truths, of which the Old Testament may be said to be the guardian, be preserved in their basic significance, others as well can and must be brought within the Church for its enrichment. Thus moral ideals such as Confucius taught should have their place and the devotional literature of Indian bhaktas may contribute to the devout life of the Indian Christian while not displacing the Psalms as signposts of the divine revelation. In these and other elements in the non-Christian faiths will be found much that is permanently precious and that confirms the central revelation which Christ crowns and by which their worth will be assessed. In particular all else that the traditions of the nations contribute must be measured against the picture of Christ Himself and obtain His sanction.

Professor Phillips' book should be of great service to the Younger Churches in enabling them to see how Israel may lead them more deeply into the significance of Christ and of their duty to Him. When that is secured everything else in relation to their national heritages should fall into its appointed place. It should also provoke us of the Older Churches to re-examine our relation to the message that has come to us from the hands of the Jewish race and our relation to those from whose hands that message has been received by us. NICOL MACNICOL.

ANOTHER UTOPIA.

Viscount Samuel stands in the same relation to *An Unknown Land* (Allen & Unwin ; 12s. 6d. net) as Bacon did to 'New Atlantis.' Both profess to be second-hand reporters of the discovery of an Utopia. It is here alleged that a friend of Lord Samuel's became convinced that New Atlantis was no figment but a geographical reality. He set out to find it, and being shipwrecked, quite in the traditional style, somewhere in the South Pacific, he found himself with a few companions on Bensalem, the veritable New Atlantis of Bacon's friend.

Bensalem, itself unknown to the civilized world, knew all that the civilized world had accomplished since Bacon's time, through the Baconian 'missionships.' Further, they had made advances of their own. It is a land that has got rid of practically all the ills from which we suffer. There is no unemployment, no vice, no ignorance, no poverty. There is for all nine-hours-a-week work at necessary occupations. The great leisure then afforded is spent on a variety of subsidiary employments—art, invention of still more wonderful machines, study of all the best literature of every age and clime, and so on, with abundance of social amenities, recreation, and sport. Government is reduced to a minimum. It rests just on universal good-will. If there be a penal system, it is in the background, never needed. Of the 'State' there is little conception. Bensalemites think it a curious aberration to personify, not to speak of deifying the 'State.'

This absence of the woes to which we are subject is due partly to their high physical development—disease is almost completely conquered—partly to the enormous expansion of brain-power secured by mechanically enlarging the skull. One is just a bit doubtful here. Is there even a general, not to say inevitable, connexion between skull-measurement and brain-power ?

What of religion ? Once Bensalem was Christian. But the traditional creeds, clergy, and ritual became ineffective, and the churches were almost empty. So all mere tradition was scrapped. An eclectic and simple theistic faith with no creeds, nor requiring any special clergy, was evolved, and the places of worship filled up again.

What one wonders, after perusal of a charming book, mainly is this—what of sin ? Will men sin no more if you give them bigger and better brains ? Their follies, their mistakes, will undoubtedly be fewer, but—their sins ?

As an 'Utopia' one may think that the performance is marred by bringing in for good-natured satire the 'islands,' which reproduce Russia, Germany, and Britain. One wonders if Bensalem could not do more about them than Lord Samuel's friend allows it.

W. D. NIVEN.

In *This Seed of Faith* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press ; $1.50) Dr. Henry M. Battenhouse makes a praiseworthy attempt to aid the 'questioning modern' to step from fear and doubt to faith and assurance. He begins by showing the need of advance from materialism, vitalism, or humanism to theism as perfected in Christianity. In coming to personal satisfaction on religious questions one must pay reverence to three 'altars'—tradition, personal experience, and, above all, Christ. Then the 'approaches' to Christian Faith are described—Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection, and Pentecost. This leads to disquisitions on the good life, the good news, and the Church and the world.

It is a good programme, but the treatment of problems is too facile. There is an abundance of illustrative literary citations—not always accurately made.

Miss Jane Lane in *King James the Last* (Dakers ; 12s. 6d. net) has made a valiant effort to help a lame dog over a stile. James was neither a good man nor a good king. He was immoral, obstinate, and religious. His immoralities may perhaps be palliated by the custom of the time. His failure as a king was certainly due to his conception of kingship ; and it is an amazing fact that a serious writer of history should at this day actually advance this theory as the true nature of monarchy. The king should make war and peace ; he should make the laws and execute them ; he alone should have in his hands the power of life and death over criminals ; in a word, he should rule the kingdom. In this conception what room is there for a parliament ? What is its function ? It is to provide extraordinary revenue in time of national need ! This kind of monarchy might have been in force to-day but for the aristocracy or (alternatively) the oligarchy or the moneyed interest. The purpose of Miss Lane's book is to describe the battle of English monarchy against this unscrupulous clique of intriguers who would not let the king rule. The book may be described as that staggering thing—a Jacobite tract written at a time when the Jacobite conception of kingship is as extinct as the Dodo. It is only fair to acknowledge the wide reading displayed in Miss Lane's well-written pages. Also, it must be said that she faces up to most of the facts of James's life, however wrong-headed her interpretations of them may be. Also the book is undeniably interesting. It has little value as history, however. Probably the quaintest thing about it is that it is sponsored by Mr. Compton Mackenzie.

The Discipline of Peace, by Dr. K. E. Barlow (Faber & Faber; 8s. 6d. net), is the work of 'a young physician practising in a Midland city' who is convinced that there can be no enduring world-peace until man learns to live more in harmony with his environment. Especially he must understand his dependence upon the soil. Modern man in this industrial and materialistic age has exploited and impoverished the soil, unscrupulously plundering its irreplacable riches, until vast tracts, once fertile, have been turned into parched and barren desert. He has robbed the soil to feed the city, and has acted as if there were no limit to this process. The writer is convinced that if this policy of spoliation and of competition for raw material is dominant at the peace conference the result will be disastrous. Man must enter into intelligent partnership with the vital forces of Nature and be content to co-operate rather than to dominate. The writer's style is somewhat diffuse and the course of his argument not always clear. There is much interesting information given about erosion of the soil and the processes by which plant and animal life is sustained, but the application of all this to the problem of maintaining world-peace is left very vague.

Social Control and Personal Freedom, by the Rev. Leyton Richards, M.A., is the third of the essays in Social and Economic Reconstruction issued by the Fellowship of Reconciliation (4d. net). It deals with the delicate problem of how to hold the balance even between the claims of the individual and of the social order. The tendency of late has been all in the direction of more State control, but Fascism has shown how utterly subversive of freedom the omnipotent State may be, and there is now becoming evident a deepened concern for the safeguarding of personal liberty. The writer has manifestly been influenced by Walter Lippman's admirable book on 'The Good Society,' and accordingly he holds that State Collectivism would be too unwieldy and impracticable, but that the State should exercise effective control in the restraint and harmonizing of conflicting interests. The whole problem is discussed with a calmness and good sense which make the essay worth reading.

All who are interested in religious education are familiar with the educational methods of Mr. Ernest H. Hayes. A fresh example of them is provided by the Senior Lessons on the Agreed Syllabuses, the second volume of which has appeared under the title, *Myself and My Fellows* (Religious Education Press; cloth 4s. 6d., paper 4s. net). This book follows 'God and Myself' and includes the following subjects: Our Lord shows us the way; Our Lord provides the needed power; The Apostles learn the way of service; Apostles who served in a later age (S. Patrick and others); the Christian way of life; Pioneers in service (Raikes, Pasteur, Booth, and others); My sphere of service. In these lessons everything a teacher needs is provided and careful instruction in method is given. The objection that the teacher is spoon-fed is not valid. Many teachers need to be spoon-fed, and can make good use of the material offered to them. And even the good teacher will find much here that he needs and cannot obtain without a great deal of research. We are all for guidance as thorough and as helpful as we find in these manuals.

St. Mark's Gospel, by the Rev. M. D. R. Willink, S.Th. (S.P.C.K.; cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s. 6d. net), is a quite excellent little piece of work. It is in the form of a short introduction 'not meant to be read instead of the Gospel, but with it, to give you an idea of how the whole book and story hold together.' The writer imagines St. Peter telling the story in the Church of Rome while the members of that Church are puzzling over St. Paul's Epistle. This may appear fanciful but it leads to the bringing out of some interesting parallels between the Gospel and the Epistle. At the same time it does not in any degree overshadow the analysis of the Gospel which is very carefully done and in such a readable way as both to elucidate and commend its teaching and purpose.

The Song of Songs has a perennial interest for almost every class of reader, and any serious study of the book is welcome. Yet its original structure is still a matter of dispute. The 'dramatic' theory has been revived by Mr. Harry Moorhouse under the title, *The Crocus of Sharon* (Stockwell; 5s. net), and he creates out of it a really beautiful little play. His translation of the text is most attractive, though it is sometimes rather free, particularly in its insertion and repetition of words and phrases. We frequently get a 'stairlike' parallelism in the English text which is not present in the Hebrew. From time to time, too, we could wish for more accurate appreciation of the *nuances* conveyed by the Hebrew tense variations. The translation is followed by a full discussion of the form, including criticisms of other views (the Ishtar-liturgy theory alone does not receive extended treatment) and many aspects of the book as drama are studied. The book will give pleasure even to those who remain unconvinced as to the correctness of the critical view on which Mr. Moorhouse bases his work.

Eschatology and the Hope of a New World. (*Concluded*).

By Professor John Foster, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

We cannot let this subject rest until we have got back over the centuries to the period of the New Testament itself. That is where for us as Christians it all begins. I have chosen to lead you back along the pathway of the Church's history. We do well to remind ourselves that that is the way by which it has all proceeded. To understand the Bible aright we must never forget that it is to be viewed not in isolation but through the life of the Church.

So let us continue our pilgrimage, from St. Cyprian and Origen in the third century, back to the first. That is not difficult. I have a suspicion that Bishop Cyprian when he wrote about the world growing old was doing that too. If he was not quoting the words, he was echoing the despair of a first century Jew. The age of our Lord and His Apostles was a time when men despaired of the world around them :

'For the youth of the world is past,
And the strength of the creation already exhausted,
And the advent of the times is very short,
Yea, they have passed by ;
And the pitcher is near to the cistern,
And the ship to the port,
And the course of the journey to the city,
And life to (its) consummation.' [1]

'The last noble utterance of Judaism,' says R. H. Charles [2] of this *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, 'before it plunged into the dark and oppressive years that followed the destruction of Jerusalem.' Yes, it was the end. Never again was a comparable voice of Hebrew prophecy to be heard. It was the end of an age. In the New Testament is the same despair concerning the times :

'Little children, it is the last hour. . . .'
'The whole world lieth in the evil one.' [3]

But strangely enough, you and I call it the *first* century, not the last.

There had been two streams of Jewish eschatological thought. It is not without reason, or by accident, that before the time of our Lord, these two have flowed together. The first was the idea of the Messianic Kingdom as central in a redeemed world order—and to that extent this-worldly. The second pictured the consummation of the ages, and the eternal reign above. By flowing together I do not mean that obvious hybrid, that artificial combination, found in the development of eschatology which the Millennial Dawnist who offered me the handbill had got hold of (from the Book of the Revelation) : a Kingdom of the Messiah on earth, not eternal but for a thousand years ; followed by judgment, the winding up of the whole world order, and the beginning of the Kingdom of Heaven. I mean rather the way that in apocalyptic literature you find yourself switched from one idea to the other, this worldly, otherworldly, the Kingdom here, the Kingdom yonder, with bewildering confusion—confusion which is not artificial but does belong to the nature of the vision and the dream. In Christian writings there gradually emerges from this confusion one further fact which we must now add to our two previous findings : It is in the Church that the eternal takes shape within the temporal ; it is in the Church that in some measure the end has already come, because there the new beginning has already been made.

Having come to the very foundations with this New Testament period, I feel I must illustrate not only point three, reached here, but one and two which have preceded. It is important to recognize that they have all been there from the start.

One whose chief interest is in Church History will turn most often to the third of the four Gospels. That is the only one which has come down to us with that necessary Volume II. attached, and, since it seems likely that Volume II. was contemplated from the start, is written with a unique, and for us inevitable, perspective. I shall select three passages from St. Luke's Gospel, with related passages in the Acts, to show that the three points, illustrated before from the later history of the Church, are already in the Apostolic Age being assumed regarding the eschatological teaching of our Lord Himself :

1. *The this-worldly triumph cannot be separated from, cannot be understood without, the transcendent faith.*

Volume I., Lk 17^{20f} :

'And being asked . . . when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation : neither shall they say, Lo, here ! or, There ! for lo, the kingdom of God is in the midst [4] of you.'

Volume II. takes up the subject, Ac 1^{6-8} :

'Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel ? And he said unto them, It is not for

[1] 2 Bar 85^{10}.
[2] *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.*, ii. 470.
[3] 1 Jn 2^{18}, 5^{19}.
[4] Translation as in R.V. margin.

> you to know times or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority. But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.'

The words here heard from the lips of our Lord are a fitting opening to St. Luke's Volume II. The disciples ask again about the Kingdom, the Apocalyptic hope which is determinative for the life of the Church in its earliest days. The end of the ages is at hand, and they wait His return in glory, which shall not be long delayed. Volume II. is going to give us a picture of the tense excitement and expectancy of these early days. But at the outset the writer is taking pains to correct our perspective. The story is not going to be one of a Church *merely* waiting for the end of the world, but of a Church which sends forth His witnesses—Jerusalem, all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. These are the actual three divisions of the book. The first two, which make up roughly half the book's contents, have as their main subject the gradual opening of the door to the Gentiles. The rest is the record of the travels and the triumphs of the Apostle of the Gentiles. While the story is not carried so far as the uttermost part of the earth, the direction of the book is towards the world's capital. But if this is a correcting of perspective, it is not a cancelling out of eschatology. The this-worldly triumph is because of the transcendent faith.

2. *The triumph and glory of the Apocalypse are rightly predicated of the faithful even amid the sordidness of the struggle, even while to earthly eyes the issue is still in doubt.*

Volume I., Lk 9^{24-27}:

> 'Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it . . . when the Son of Man cometh in his own glory, and the glory of the Father, and of the holy angels. But I tell you of a truth, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God.'

Volume II., Ac 7^{55f}, brings us to St. Stephen, the first who does lose his life for His sake:

> 'He looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.'

Amid the shouting and the stones and the dust; while the garments are laid at the feet of a young man named Saul; with the issue still in doubt (in that young man's heart it was that very day beginning to be joined); there are the triumph and glory of the Apocalypse.

3. *It is in the Church that the eternal takes shape within the temporal; there the new beginning has already been made.*

Volume I., Lk 21^{25}:

> 'And there shall be signs in sun and moon and stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, in perplexity, . . . men fainting for fear. . . . And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.'

Volume II. hastens to take up the theme, Ac $2^{17.\ 19.\ 20}$:

> 'In the last days,' says St. Peter, quoting the eschatology of Joel, '. . . I will shew wonders in the heaven above, and signs on the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke: the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the day of the Lord come, that great and notable day.'

Careful reading of that sermon on the day of Pentecost is a shock to our literal-mindedness. All this, says the Apostle, has been fulfilled in the miracles and wonders and signs which God did by Jesus of Nazareth in the midst of you; its fulfilment is continued in His passion, resurrection and ascension; it is crowned by this descent of the Spirit which indeed marks the Day of the Lord. That great and notable day is none other than the birthday of His Church.

Is the solution to our understanding of the strong and continued presence of the eschatological element in our faith to be found along these lines? I feel that while there is much help in the paradox of the phrase 'realised eschatology,' that explanation stops short of the full truth. It stops, where Biblical scholarship has too often stopped, short of the Church. Let us summarize thus: The coming in glory, the judgment, the triumph of the King—these are implied in faith in the Messiah. But the Messiah has come; that is the central fact of Christian belief. Therefore these accompaniments of His coming cannot be long delayed. 'Maran atha; our Lord cometh.' Such a faith as this becomes clarified by a growing emphasis upon the Church, not merely as the interim community which awaits His revelation in glory, judgment, and triumph, but as the community in whose worship He is glorified, in whose discipline His judgment is come, in whose doing of His will His triumph is extended: 'The Church which is His Body, the fulfilment of Him who is being out-and-out fulfilled.' Moreover, we must note that even as this is begun already in the Church Militant here on earth, so it extends without a break, to its ultimate perfection, into the beyond—the Church Triumphant. *There* are the glories of heaven, the last judgment, the final triumph, different not in kind but in degree from the earthly life of the Christian in His Church . . . 'that Christ may be all in all.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

What God is Like.

By the Reverend Geo. Johnstone Jeffrey, B.D., Glasgow.

'God is love.'—1 Jn 4^{8}.

During the last war I knew a small boy of four. He used to see soldiers, sailors, and a few airmen passing his door and asked many questions about them. Had he been a boy of ten, he would have asked his mother, when he saw a soldier in the street: 'What regiment does he belong to?' But he had only a few words, and all he could say was: '*What's that man for?*"

Many a child asks a question like that. To begin with he asks: 'What is *mother* for?' There were two boys known to me, one named Leslie, the other Guy. They are fine doctors now, but this was twenty years ago. Guy was the younger—say about seven. Leslie was fourteen. One night their mother was hearing Guy his lessons. He was tired and cross, and couldn't or wouldn't get down to them. His mother tried hard to see him through them, but it was of no use and she gave it up. After she had left the room Leslie took his brother in hand, and by pleading and coaxing, they got through in the end. When Guy was shutting up his books, Leslie said to him: 'Guy, do you think you were playing the game with Mother just now? You know how kind she always is to us. There is simply nothing she wouldn't do to help us.' Guy could bear the sermon no longer and burst out: 'Well, *it's her trade*!'

Yes, that's just what a mother is for—just loving. She loves you when you are good and when you are—not so good: when you are clean or untidy; clever or stupid; well or ill. 'It's her trade.' Whoever lets you down, Mother won't. And so I reckon it out like this: if God made mothers, and made them like that, He must be like that too. I don't believe God makes creatures more loving than Himself. In that case, they would be greater than Himself, which is absurd. All the fires in the loving heart of your mother are but sparks from the great, loving heart of God, for 'God is love.' That's what He is *for*.

When we are asking questions like these, may we ask just one more? 'What is *a minister* for?' I would like to tell you that. Your father goes to the telephone to ring up his best friend. The lady operator seems to be keeping him rather longer than usual—then she says: '*I am trying to connect you*.' Your father says: 'Thank you'—at least, I hope he does—and then the lady goes off the line and your father is soon talking happily to his friend. You see, then, what a minister is for? All he has to do is—to get you talking to the best Friend you can ever have, the Friend you cannot see. His name is God and 'God is love.'

Hold Fast.

By the Reverend John B. Nettleship, B.A., Manchester.

'Hold fast that which is good.'—1 Th 5^{21}.

I once heard of a little boy who came to his mother looking rather uncomfortable, and said, 'Mother, you know that vase in the hall which has been handed down from generation to generation in our family?'

'Yes,' said mother.

'Well, this generation has dropped it!'

Now, there seem to be quite a lot of valuable things which this generation is dropping, and I want to try to show you how precious they are, so that *you* won't drop them. They are things which our forefathers treasured very greatly, and handed down to us that we might enjoy them too, and then, in our turn, pass them on to those who will come after us.

First of all there is *Sunday*: What a lot of people are 'dropping' that. They make Sunday like any other day, and forget that Jesus said, 'The Sabbath was made for man,' meaning that man *needs* Sunday as a day of rest and worship if he is going to be the sort of man God wants him to be.

A story is told of a man who was walking along a lonely road when he met a very poorly-dressed, hungry-looking tramp, who begged for money to buy himself a meal. The man felt in his pocket and took out a handful of coins—seven in all. He picked out six and gave them to the hungry man, and returned the seventh to his pocket, whereupon the tramp attacked his benefactor, threatening to kill him unless he handed over the remaining coin. You probably think, 'What an ungrateful wretch the man was! Not satisfied with the generous gift he had received, he must snatch for himself the remaining coin too.' Isn't that just what some people do with the days God has given them? They want not only six days, but snatch the seventh, too, for their own selfish use.

Then there is the *Bible*. Do you know that when William Tyndale first tried to circulate his English New Testament he had to smuggle the copies into this country in sacks of flour, bales of wool, and barrels? They had to be passed in secret from hand to hand among those who wished to read them, for Englishmen were forbidden to read the Bible in their own language and were liable to severe punishment for doing so. Yet, so eager were they to read God's Word that they were willing to run these risks. The Bible is another thing that is sometimes 'dropped' now. I hope you haven't done that, and that you never

will. You will find as you grow older, as so many Christian people have found, that the Bible is a great source of interest and help and inspiration.

Finally, there is your *Church* and *Sunday School*. Maybe some of your own friends have 'dropped' these. Some boys who think themselves very grown-up and clever will tell you that 'Sunday school is only for kids.' That just shows how little they know. One of the finest men I ever knew went to Sunday school till he was eighty-six!

Our Sunday, our Bible, our Church and Sunday school should be very precious to us. They have been won for us at a great cost, and if we value them and use them aright they will help to make us men and women in whom God will be well pleased, and we shall be able proudly to hand on to those who come after us a great heritage.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Main Cause of Failure.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., ABERDEEN.

'Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and said, It is a people that do err in their heart, and they have not known my ways: Unto whom I sware in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest.'—Ps $95^{10.\ 11}$.

The journey from Egypt to the Promised Land could have been completed in a comparatively short time. The distance was not such that forty long years were required to cover it. Yet the astonishing fact is that it took all that time for Israel to enter into the inheritance which God had prepared for them.

If the distance between the two lands does not account for the delay, what does account for it? A stranger to the story might imagine that it was due to defective leadership, to some ineptitude in Moses. Again, a stranger to Israel's God might imagine that it was due to some wavering on the part of God who, perhaps, repented of the promise which He had earlier given. Plausible as such reasons appear, however, neither of them, if the words of the text are considered, is satisfactory. In point of fact, the children of Israel had an incomparable leader in Moses whose character and vision and practical ability admirably fitted him for the rôle he was called to fill. Moreover, in Israel's God there was no variableness nor any shadow cast by turning, and, having given a promise, He could be relied upon to fulfil it.

If neither defects in her leader nor a *volte face* on the part of God accounts for Israel's delay in entering into her inheritance—what then? Looking back, the author of this psalm attributes Israel's dire experience to Israel herself. 'It is,' said God, 'a people that do err in their heart, and they have not known my ways.' Until their heart was right and they came to know His ways, they must be deprived of Canaan. To the author of this psalm it seemed worth while to put Israel's posterity in remembrance of such a fact. Like Israel, they were inclined to attribute their failures to certain defects in their leaders or to indifference or forgetfulness on the part of God. In point of fact, this writer reminded them, some failures were due to neither of such things but to some defect in themselves. There were prizes they must be worthy to win and goals they must be worthy to reach. Lacking worth, they must spend all their days in 'shallows and in miseries.'

It is a long time since this writer penned his warning. Yet to my mind it is not irrelevant to the circumstances in which we find ourselves to-day. There are some who are surprised that ever such a plight as the present should have overtaken mankind. There are many more who marvel that the forces of righteousness, matched against forces so wholly evil, should suffer such reverses and that their victory should be so long delayed. Why, they ask, should such things be?

1. Some, and we must treat their utterance with respect, attribute our present plight to the lack of foresight in those who once administered our affairs and our serious reverses to our lack of sufficient and adequate weapons of war. Given men of capacity skilled in modern warfare, and given arms comparable to those of our enemies, they argue, our defeats will soon be turned to victories and the ultimate triumph be hastened.

If you are prepared to grant that the evil which at present stalks through the earth must be put down by force, then the contention of the men to whom I refer must be treated with respect. To endeavour to quell a despotic power which possesses ingenious means of protecting itself and of harming others with weapons which are obsolete is, without doubt, to court disaster and defeat. To be content in such a war that second-class brains should contend with first-class brains is complacency run riot. We must have men of ability and we must have up-to-date equipment. So far, the men to whom I refer are right. But, even acknowledging that, can we agree that such are the only essentials for victory and that what alone hinders its speedy coming is lack of able men and suitable arms? On the National Day of Prayer, the Archbishop of Canterbury reminded us that in this war it is not just a case of one army pitting itself against another, but of one way of life contending with its antithesis. That being the case, while we may succeed in killing more of the enemy than they, on their part, manage to kill, the evil of which they are possessed cannot be finally eradicated by shot and shell but by weapons of another order—character, and love of goodness and truth and beauty. It would repay some of us who are persuaded that only increased efficiency and increased armaments can restore the world to sanity to remember that, though Israel possessed an incomparable leader in Moses, she was prevented for forty long years from entering into the Promised Land. Increased efficiency and increased equipment are of themselves not enough if we would attain certain ends.

2. Others, and we must treat their utterance with respect, attribute our present plight and

righteousness' failure to overcome evil, to indifference on the part of God. They point us to the frenzied activity of our fellows in field and factory and mine and to the gallant sacrifices made by so many standing but on the threshold of life. Nothing, they maintain, is lacking there. What *is* lacking, they maintain, is the live interest of God in those things which, so it is claimed, are His chief concern.

Considered off-hand, such a contention seems sound. Why God should permit evil men to prosper so and allow their diabolical plans to reach fulfilment is a question which none of us can answer anything like adequately. On the other hand, however, is it true to suggest that God is wholly uninterested in what befalls righteousness and righteous men? Was that not the charge which the Israelites levelled against Him in spite of the fact that when they were pursued by the Egyptians He rescued them, and when they were hungry fed them, and when they were thirsty gave them drink? Is it possible that we have been as blind to God's providential dealings with us as the Israelites were? Suppose we cast our minds back across the past three years. There were moments, and the country's leaders have never sought to hide the fact from us, when it seemed that the full might of our foes must be hurled against us and when it looked as though we would be hard put to it to survive. Yet we were preserved—and preserved, it is acknowledged on every hand, not by any native cleverness, nor by the genius of some gifted leader, but by the mercy of God. Let those, therefore, who charge God with indifference and who attribute the delay of the victory of righteousness to His forgetfulness think on such things.

3. Is it possible that in our case, as in the case of the Israelites, final responsibility lies, not in our lack of proper equipment, nor in the God whom we serve, but in ourselves?

I was recently struck by an article which was written by one of the clearest thinkers of our day and generation. 'What if,' he asked, 'God is far more concerned than we are that the tides of tyranny should be rolled back, and the war come to an end, and yet victory is still beyond our grasp because, while we are in our present mood, our victory would be more disastrous than a continuation of the war? What if our pride and complacency must be broken before we can be instruments in the hands of God?' These are hard, and perhaps unwelcome, questions—so unwelcome that many of us may resent them being asked. But facts, if they *are* facts, don't become less facts because we choose to ignore them or to resent them when they are brought before our notice. It may be true, and if true had better be faced, that the evil which at present is stalking through the earth can only be finally overcome, not by force of arms alone, although force of arms may be necessary, but by a greater force of good.

Lord Elton, who a few years ago wrote the biography of a former Prime Minister, has recently written a book in which he brings us face to face with this very fact. 'Is it not possible,' he asks, 'to champion virtue without possessing it, to defend the ultimate moral standards without living up to them, to fight for democracy without practising it, to risk our lives for Christendom without being Christians? . . . Long ago,' he reminds us, 'men believed that the supreme tasks, such as the Crusades or the quest of the Grail, demanded of those who undertook them not only, perhaps not so much, a certain quality of life in the past, as a progressive effort of self-discipline in the present. It was not so much the crusader who made the crusade as the crusade that made the crusader. To win your victory you had, sooner or later, to earn it. Your enemy might be a brute, a tyrant, and a pagan, but victory would not drop into your lap, unless, or until, you yourself were decent, just, and Christian. . . . For us, therefore,' he suggests, 'the supreme purpose and meaning of this war must be that we are offered an opportunity of becoming worthy of victory in it.'

Such words are worth pondering. It is not enough that we should have gallant men prepared to make sacrifices, nor enough that, occasionally, we should present our petitions to God for His immediate and effective intervention. As individuals and as a nation we must live as men and women who are capable of turning a victory to good account, to the benefit, indeed, of all mankind. The values which make life worth the living must be respected, and the sanctities without which any order of society soon decays must be reverenced.

In this total war, we have been told, every man and woman counts. Because we have come to believe that, we have given ourselves with selfless devotion to every effort calculated to further our cause and to bring victory nearer. Without minimising the importance of any such effort, there is one thing we must not neglect to do—to cultivate in ourselves and to see that there is cultivated in others a regard for spiritual values, for, upon our loyalty to them, will depend the coming of victory and the use we make of it once it has been achieved.

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Prayer Life of Jesus.

'Lord, teach us to pray.'—Lk 11[1].

The supreme Master in the art of prayer is Jesus. So, with the disciples we say, 'Lord, teach *us* to pray. To pray as Thou dost pray. Obviously, Thou hast a secret we have not yet found. Share it with us.'

What was the secret of Jesus? What were the things that particularly distinguished His prayer life?

The first thing, surely, which strikes us about the prayer life of Jesus is its extreme naturalness and simplicity. When the Pharisees prayed, they did it all so solemnly, so pompously, so formally. They put on special garments for it, adopted a special air, used a special language. Jesus was

so different. He did, of course, avail Himself of the usual synagogue and temple opportunities for prayer. 'As his custom was,' we read, 'he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day.' But more frequently, we find Jesus slipping off to the hillsides for prayer, just as He was and whenever He felt the need of it. And whenever in the course of His ministry some special call is made upon Him, we find Him just then and there, on the road or at the meal table, quite simply and naturally lifting up His eyes in prayer. Prayer to Jesus was not something extra, something tacked on to the main fabric of life. It was the very warp and woof of that fabric.

There ought to be this simple, natural quality about our prayer life. Of course, this is not to say that there should be no system or discipline about our prayer life. The world is so much with us, we must deliberately set aside some period each day, preferably first thing in the morning, when, whether we feel like it or not, we can be still and realize the presence of God. As in everything else in life, so in prayer, we must learn to discipline ourselves. But at the same time, we should encourage in ourselves the habit of sometimes in the day, in our home or shop or office, retiring for a moment into silence where God is, the habit of just lifting up our eyes when any special strain is put upon us, the habit of there and then giving thanks whenever we have been moved by a glimpse of beauty or music or a book or someone's kindness. After all, God is our Father, ever at our side, ever anxious to help. Why not then turn naturally to Him, wherever we are?

Another thing which strikes us about the prayer life of Jesus is that with Him prayer was nearly always of the nature of a quiet waiting and receiving. There is no busy petitioning in it. He certainly encouraged His disciples to make known all their requests before God. But He Himself practically never prayed for actual things. Rather what He seemed to seek in prayer was just the strength and guidance and peace of God.

And this is what prayer in its deepest essence really is. It is a going aside, a shutting of the door upon the clamorous world, a deliberate relaxing of ourselves, in order that we may receive the peace and power of God. That peace and power are always about us, but the demands of life are so insistent, our spirits are so insensitive, we are not always conscious of them. It is said that before a battle Napoleon used to stand alone in his tent, and one by one his generals would enter, grasp his hand in silence, and then go out again, fired with a new determination to die for France. Prayer is like that: a quiet putting of our hand into God's, a quiet lifting of our eyes to His. An old French priest, who used to spend long hours before the crucifix above the altar in his little parish church, was asked what he really did. 'Oh,' replied the old man, 'He looks at me, and I look at Him.'

How very differently some people regard prayer! They look upon it simply as a kind of magic for trying to get what otherwise they feel they would not get. There is, of course, a place for petition in it, but petition only for those things for which we can imagine Jesus in our position asking. That is what prayer 'in the name of Jesus' really means. But prayer at its deepest is that act whereby, through deliberately turning aside from the world, through reading over a psalm or a hymn or a passage from the Gospels, we so hush and prepare our hearts that God may be able to make Himself real. It is the Presence of God that first of all we seek in prayer, and God's greatest gift in prayer is simply Himself.

And how urgently we need that sense of His Presence! Without it, life loses its freshness and significance, becomes mean and petty and trivial. Without it, we are apt to lose our reverence for others and become harsh and scornful and proud. Without it, our nerves are inclined to get the better of us and we lose all poise and balance and grasp. 'Until we realize,' writes Evelyn Underhill, 'that it is better, more useful, to spend, let us say, the odd ten minutes in the morning in feeling and finding the Eternal than in flicking the newspaper—that this will send us off to the day's work really endowed with new power of dealing with circumstances—we have not yet begun to live the life of the Spirit or found the power of doing our best work, whatever it may be.'

A third fact which strikes us about the prayer life of Jesus is that with Him prayer was sometimes an agony. The supreme instance of this, of course, was His praying in Gethsemane the night before He was crucified. And for those who have eyes to read between the lines of the gospel narrative, there were other times when His praying was an agony. When half-way through His ministry, when He was still so young and in love with life and Galilee and His friends, He realized that His way was ever nearing a skull-shaped hill, and He climbed Mount Hermon there later to be transfigured, surely there at the first His praying must have been an agony!

And in the prayer life of all the greatest souls, there has been this occasional agony. General Gordon knew this agony. 'I had a terrible struggle with Agag this morning,' he wrote in his diary. 'I had a terrible half-hour, hewing Agag in pieces before the Lord.'

Why were there these moments of agony in the prayer life of Jesus, in the prayer life of His finest followers? Why? Because in prayer a man does not seek, as some apparently think, to bend God's will into line with his own, but rather to bend his own will into line with God's. And often that will of God is seen to be an austere demand cutting right across the line of a man's dearest ambitions. When the call of God finally came to Temple Gairdner to go out as a missionary to Cairo, he used to wake at night overcome with reluctance and shrinking. 'I have found ambition dreadfully difficult to cope with,' he told his sister-confidante. 'It seems so natural, especially with one's upbringing and education, to look forward to making a mark and a name,

and so awfully hard to resign oneself to the idea of living and dying tucked away in some corner.'

Does all this talk about agony in prayer sound a little foreign to some of us? If it does, perhaps it is that we have never realized how high our Christian calling is, that it is not just to be decent and kindly, but to be like Jesus—as brave, as trustful, as selfless, as willing, as was He, to bear something of the sin and suffering of this world and put it away by the giving of ourselves.

The last characteristic of the prayer life of Jesus, I would like to mention, is its unselfishness. Again and again, Jesus went aside to pray, not for Himself, but for others. We have only to read the High-Priestly prayer in the seventeenth chapter of John's Gospel to realize how much of His prayer must always have been concerned with others. And we will recall how He said to Peter: 'Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee.' Jesus evidently firmly believed in the power of intercession. Obviously He did not conceive of intercession as a reminding of God of some emergency which He has apparently overlooked. He always taught that God is a Father who knoweth the things we have need of, even before we ask, and that He is ceaselessly working to heal and to bless. It helps me to think that perhaps He thought of intercession as partly, at least, a matter of 'atmosphere.' We all carry round with us a certain atmosphere. If our own prayer life is real, that atmosphere will be so charged with God that in our contacts with others God will be able to draw very near to them. The late Bishop Gore, for instance, lived so close to God that, after his death, a prominent Quaker wrote: 'I never visited Bishop Gore without feeling a new or closer liaison with the Eternal, a strengthening of the hands of God.'

May it not be, then, that when our Lord prayed for people, He put round them that same God-filled atmosphere, and that atmosphere enabled God to approach them far more closely? As He prayed for Peter, perhaps it seemed to Peter that his Master was really beside him and with those loved eyes on him he simply could not falter or fail.

'Lord, teach us to pray! As simply and as naturally as Thou didst pray! As quietly and as receptively! As agonizingly intent on the doing of the Father's will! As caring as much for others as Thou didst care, and as certain that our prayers can cut another channel for the approach of the ever-living and ever-working God!'[1]

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

The Call to Suffer.

BY THE REVEREND FREDERICK H. PICKERING, M.A., DURHAM.

'For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake.—Ph 1^{29}.

Professor Joad wrote an article recently in which he related something of the spiritual struggle he endured in his conversion from agnosticism to faith. He entitled that arresting testimony, for that is what it is, 'From sunlight to shadow.' He tells us that in his agnosticism he was at ease, that he was free to do just what he wanted to do, and, as he puts it, 'he was very well, thank you.' But for a variety of reasons he ceased to be very well when challenged by all the torture and murder and rape which shames Europe to-day, and it was through this very fact of evil in God's world that he was forced to believe in God again. And now his freedom has been lost in the burden of faith. From his sunlit way he has entered the shadowed valley of Christianity.

Now that experience of Joad raises a problem which is a challenge to every considering Christian. 'It is given unto us not only to believe in Jesus, but also to suffer for Him.' The truth is faith in Christ does not exempt a man from trials and temptations; it does not relieve him of intellectual problems and doubts and struggles; it does not release him from the way of suffering. Faith is not a life of ease and comfort, devoid of all challenges. The very charter of discipleship is difficult. 'If any man come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily and follow me.' And remember Christ suffered and died on a cross.

But, says some one: 'I always thought that Christ is life and joy and peace and all those blessed qualities that go to enrich life.' Yes, indeed He is, but—and it is a big 'but.' A grain of wheat has to die before it can help to swell the harvest. And we have got to die to self and sin before we can ever know the life eternal. And the dying process is not easy; it is very hard and often shadowed. But when with Christ we die to self, we find ourselves walking in newness of life—life in Him. There are some who imagine that once take Christ into their life and immediately all their problems, intellectual, moral, and amoral, will disappear. Not so. They are only in the beginning of the way to get them resolved. And when you begin to seek His light upon them the process, like all maturing life, is painful. They do just what they please. Follow Christ and you will get many hard knocks. You will, with every truly Christian man, pass through a shadowed valley. Never listen to those appeals of an ignorant emotionalism to close with an easy, anæmic Christianity. A decadent religion is easy, but Christ's way is never easy and costless.

Do not mistake me. Christ in you is a very real thing, but you only know Him when you really begin to share life with Him, when you start to fight the good fight with Him. Said a friend to me the other day: 'You know, Christ was more real to me in the last war when I had to stand up for my faith in the army than often He is now in the quiet of the Church and my easy, cloistered life.' That's just it. It's only when you are really up against it that He becomes real to you.

This is also true about Christ's joy and peace.

[1] G. T. Bellhouse, *Our Sufficient Beauty*, 136.

His joy becomes most real when you have to suffer for Him. In fact, Christian joy is never found in an easy-going, careless kind of Christian life, where you do nothing for Jesus Christ and His great purposes in the world. Read the lives of the men and women who have made the history of the Church, and one and all will tell you that joy is found in the fires. Look at Christ. He is going to suffer, but lifting His Cross He is speaking of His joy. Paul and Silas are flung into a dark, dirty prison, and at the midnight hour they both sing praises unto God. So it is, right through the struggling history of the Church. There is joy in Christ, joy before which the scintillating pleasures of this world pale into insignificance; but only when you are prepared to walk the way of suffering for His sake. That is one of the paradoxes of the faith. And is that not the real trouble with the Christianity in our churches—it is too easy, too comfortable? It is terribly possible to worship Christ in the parish church on Sunday, and serve the Devil the rest of the week. Yes, our Christianity is very easy. We have to go to the persecuted Churches in Europe to feel the real throbbing life of the Spirit.

So it is with wisdom. Christ's wisdom is only vouchsafed to those who acknowledge their ignorance and need of it. Joad finds himself in a shadowed way, a way of doubt and ignorance, a way of challenging evil, a way of intellectual bankruptcy. But when in humility he confesses it, the light breaks. 'Here,' he says, 'is the paradox that one is driven to believe in the existence of God precisely because of the fact of evil in the world.' It was the problem of trying to reconcile the fact of pain and evil in the world with a beneficent Creator that turned him to agnosticism, and now it is this same dark, insoluble problem that brings him back to faith again. And this in spite of his inability to see any answer to the intellectual arguments which, for so long, he thought conclusive. The wisdom of this world, Joad has discovered with Paul, is simply foolishness with God.

And so it is with peace. Christ's peace is a very real experience. All the saints speak of it and our own experience authenticates it. But that peace is not to be found in the easy way of a cloistered life. The New Testament is a book of conflict, and yet its vocabulary is compact of joy and peace. That's another Christian paradox. 'My peace I give unto you. Not as the world gives give I unto you,' said Christ. The world gives its peace in arm-chairs, with good books, and all the soft comforts of life. And they are not to be despised. But Christ's peace is of a different order. It is in the heart, in the spirit of a man, in his will and conscience and hidden parts. And it only becomes real when we have the courage to stand up to life squarely, and brave its tempests, and fight the good fight. As the old hymn puts it:

> To do the will of Jesus, this is rest.

Let me close with a poet's words which enshrine the whole truth.

> Not within cloistered walls,
> Not in the peaceful glade,
> Not in the sheltered home
> Neath the trees spreading shade;
> But on the mountain side
> Wind swept,
> Crossing the desert bare,
> Sun scorched,
> Braving the torrents stream,
> Flooded,
> Out on the battle field,
> Bloody,
> Unsheathed His sword,
> Here find my Lord.

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Meaning of Advent.

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT BROWN, B.A., B.D., EDINBURGH.

'Thy kingdom come.'—Mt 6^{10}.

To-day in the Calendar of the Western Church, Anglican and Roman, is the first Sunday in Advent. The Eastern Orthodox Church celebrates the six weeks prior to Christmas as a season of reflection. In both branches of the Church, Eastern and Western, the custom is a very ancient one.

In breaking away from the older Church tradition which in those days was impeding spiritual life, the Protestant Reformers perhaps went too far in breaking away completely from the observance of the Christian Year with all its hallowed associations. Certainly in our times there is much to be said for a revival of a closer observance of 'times' and 'sacred seasons.' They present opportunities of spiritual preparation and renewal, as also of instruction in the fundamental certainties of the Faith.

In the preface to a book of Prayers for the Christian Year, issued by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Dr. Millar Patrick writes: 'The observance of the Christian Year ceased in the Church of Scotland at the Reformation. At that time there were cogent reasons for such a departure from ancient custom. With the disappearance, however, of the conditions from which they derived their force, these reasons have long since lost their validity. Other conditions have now emerged which make it desirable that a return should be made to the general practice of Christendom, on those great occasions when the transcendent facts of the Christian Faith are the subjects of commemoration. . . . Moreover, such commemorations serve a great evangelic purpose. They ensure that the basic truths of the faith once for all delivered to the saints shall be adequately proclaimed, not by preaching only, but, on these occasions, by the whole cast and substance of the Church's worship.'

The Season of Advent emphasizes three aspects of the Church's Faith.

1. *The Backward Look.*

In Advent the Church looks back through a

long and not inglorious history to the Person of its Founder, and the coming into history of that new fact in history and experience, the Christian Church—the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, we look through these facts of Christ and His Church to the long line of prophets and poets of Israel who in their day had anticipated the coming of One like unto the Son of Man. In a word, we look back over the whole drama of Redemption as portrayed in the Scriptures and in Church History, from the beginning to the time when God called men to a new fellowship with Himself in the Person of Jesus Christ. We behold a God working through history, speaking His word to men, until in the fullness of the times 'the Word became flesh.' That which was beyond history was incarnated in history—and if, as has been maintained, 'Events that make history are happenings or actions which change the human situation,' then the fact of Christ is one of the most 'historic' events in the long story of the ages. That backward look, honestly and painstakenly taken, will save us from sharing the uncritical pessimism which comes from the idea that the Church has failed.

2. *Advent has a present significance—The Inward Look.*

'Events that make history are happenings or actions which change the human situation'—that places the Gospel and the Church in a unique position in history. But what of to-day? Remember, with the poet:

Were Christ a thousand times in Bethlehem born
But not in thee—then wert thou still forlorn.

Advent is not the commemoration of the birth of a dead Jesus but the commemoration of the Coming of a Living Lord. It has therefore a present reference. It happened once and for all in history—and for all time. Dr. W. E. Orchard in his book of prayers *The Temple* has a prayer for this day which expresses in language, at once simple and moving, the present meaning of Advent observance. 'Great Father, we thank Thee that we have not to wait for Thine Advent for all history is Thy coming, and Thou art here. From the hour when Thy Spirit stirred the dark primeval deep till Jesus by the bench and on the mountain top cried, "Abba, Father," our world has been growing more conscious of Thy presence. And yet we wait for something more; strange hopes stir the hearts of men and passionate prayers break forth from their lips. Can it be that this further revelation waits upon our faith and rests with our endeavour?'

We have been too ready to desire a better world, a change of circumstance, perhaps a change in men, which would yet leave us *ourselves* unchanged. As we recall Him whose advent meant the coming of the Kingdom, we remember the challenge of His coming; and as we look within, His word loses none of its relevance: 'Except ye become as little children ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom.' Assuredly such an advent for us does not imply a way back but a way forward; a way forward to that essential childlikeness of the 'new man in Christ.'

3. *Thirdly, therefore, the Church in Advent looks Forward.*

As in the Sacrament of the Supper and the Prayer of Our Lord, the mind of the Church is turned to the future fulfilment or consummation of Divine Grace, as expressed in the words, 'Till He come,' and 'Thy Kingdom come,' so in Advent we are reminded that the present age and the present world cannot exhaust the riches of that Kingdom. The Kingdom's present manifestation points beyond itself to its consummation in God's supreme purpose of reconciliation in a world beyond the limits of space and time. If Advent means, as it assuredly does, the coming of that which was beyond history into history, it means also the blossoming into full flower of that which is in history, the seed of the Kingdom, in a world beyond history. *Both worlds are ours.* Advent means then the coming of God in Christ, the pledge of God's ever fuller coming in Christ, the promise of God's gathering all things together in Christ. God in action, past, present, and future.

When Luther was threatened by the Roman Church with dire penalties of persecution he was asked, 'Where will you be then?'—and made the gallant response, 'Where I trust I am now, in the hands of the Living God.' Had the Church but known it, there was speaking the voice of the historic faith. That is the Advent message—God past, God present, God future—and no man need lose hope in the same world as God. If we are living in days of crisis and of judgment, then it is the supreme crisis and judgment of the Kingdom of God. Within the crisis and beneath the judgment, the Church with heroic faith still dares to pray the Advent Prayer, 'Thy kingdom come.' The message of our Advent season is the message of the coming of the Kingdom of God.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

'. . . A Tide in the Affairs of Men . . .'

BY THE REVEREND GARFIELD WADE, CALVERLEY, LEEDS.

'. . . The hour is come . . .'—Jn 17^{1}.

Many of us have become familiar with the voice of the American who solemnly warns us that 'Time marches on.' We know what he means but we also know that often time does not march at all. We have known time to drag itself along as we have waited and watched for a loved one, or we have known it in moments of ecstasy to fly away like the wind. So it is with regard to the things that happen to us. Events do not march through our lives in steady rhythm. Sometimes they avoid us altogether and at others they come tumbling upon us in most disorderly fashion. Life is much more like a sea than it is like one who marches—a sea which for some time is placid enough, but which is yet creeping up inch by inch. When next we look at it the tide

is at the full with the breakers throwing themselves wildly against the sea-wall.

The life of Jesus is like that. Through youth and early manhood it is a life uneventful enough. Until He is thirty, He is a workman in a remote Galilean village. Then He steps out of the 'hidden' years and shows Himself on the banks of the Jordan. The tempo of His life is suddenly quickened. Event follows event until at the end of three years there comes the crowning event of all and Jesus is able to say, 'The hour is come'—the hour for which the whole of His life till now has been a preparation. It is good for a man to know when his life is nearing full-tide, or as Jesus would say, 'When his hour is come.' It demands real wisdom and keen insight to realize that a crisis is imminent. Jesus said of Jerusalem that it, 'knew not the hour of its visitation,' and they are the most tragic words that could be spoken of any man or community.

But if it is much to see that your hour is coming, it is more to be ready for it when it comes. Look again at Jesus. The 'hidden' years may have lacked drama but they were charged with meaning. If He lived quietly He did not live idly. It is because He lived wisely then that He is able now to face things calmly. 'What shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father glorify thy name.' Those are the words of One who was ready for the crisis when it came. When Judas arrives with the soldiers to lead Jesus away, it is Jesus who is master of the situation not they. The trouble with many of us is that we mistake the quiet years for the whole of life. We settle down comfortably and when the hour comes we are not big enough for it. The very calm of life beguiles us. The hymn gives expression to it—'Weary was our heart with waiting and the night-watch seemed so long.' The modern soldier puts it less poetically. He complains of being 'browned-off.' It is the same thing—the danger of being lulled by uneventfulness into a state of mind that is not ready when the crisis comes.

But if it is much to know when your hour is come and more to be ready for it, the greatest thing of all is to be able to throw into it all you have got and so make that hour literally your own. When Jesus is bidding farewell to His followers He warns them that their hour will come—in this case, the hour of persecution. But He tells them that it is not only their hour, it is the hour of their persecutors also. 'The hour cometh that whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth service unto God. And these things will they do because they have not known the Father, nor me. But these things have I spoken unto you, that when *their* hour is come, ye may remember them.' Victory is not given to us along with the hour. The victory has to be won. Every crisis is a battle-ground of opposing forces. In Mr. C. S. Lewis' *Screwtape Letters* the devil writes to his nephew urging him to make the most of every crisis: 'How well I know what happened at the instant when they snatched him from you. . . . One moment it seemed to be all our world; the scream of bombs, the fall of houses, the stink and taste of high explosive on the lips and in the lungs, the feet burning with weariness, the heart cold with horrors, the brain reeling, the legs aching; next moment all this was gone . . . never again to be of any account.' The forces of evil we may be sure are in every event that comes upon us and they are seeking to turn it to their own account. If the hour is to belong to us and not to them, then we must fling into it everything that we have and are.

It is no flight of fancy to suggest that the Church's hour has come. God knows, the life of the Church has flowed quietly enough in these last twenty years. In some places the waters have even been stagnant and foul. But to those who have eyes to see, signs are not wanting that the tides are creeping up. Whether their mighty forces are shortly to be released depends upon individual Christians—depends on you.

Look! You are in a world that has lost its way. The nations are locked in a death-struggle unparalleled in history. Never was hate and bitterness unleashed like this. Never were so many hearts sorrowful and afraid. This is the devil's hour, but it is yours as well. During the long uneventful years, you, probably more than any one else, have been thinking internationally. Surely you have something to say to the millions who are seeking a new way for the nations? You have sung:

> Nation with nation, land with land,
> Inarmed shall live as comrades free.

You have read of and meditated upon a world where, 'Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' You have prayed that God's will should be done on earth as it is in heaven. You know that in Christ is the only power that can bring lasting peace into the world. Do you see that your hour has come?

Look! The social life of this country is in the melting-pot. From one end of the land to the other, the old order stands condemned. What is the new order to be? A change such as may well be coming upon our social life is the devil's opportunity. But it is also yours. Surely during the time you have belonged to the Church of Jesus, you have thought out the social implications of the gospel? You have not heard the Jewish prophets thundering against social injustice and oppression for nothing have you? You have really meant it, have you not, when you have sung with such feeling:

> To serve the present age, my calling to fulfil,
> O may it all my powers engage to do my Master's will.

Very well then, this is your hour. Thousands from their disillusionment and weariness and squalor are looking to you for salvation.

It is much to see when your hour has come; it is more to be ready for it; it is much more to seize it and to throw into it everything of which you are capable.

Moral Energy: Its Sources in War and Peace.[1]

By G. F. Barbour, D.Phil., Fincastle.

There are two problems which seem at first to lie apart, but which will, I think, be most effectively answered if we treat them in close association. The first is, How best to carry forward into the post-war world the courage that we see all around us in these days; and the second, How to guard the rights of the human spirit, and especially the freedom of the Christian Church, against the ever-widening claim of the State to determine every activity of human life.

I.

First, then, how can we maintain after the war the moral energy and heroic endurance of danger which the present threat to our country has so magnificently called forth? Once more, as in the last war, the indomitable spirit and cheerful helpfulness under suffering of the ordinary man and woman have cast a new light on the greatness of human nature. Yet the words, 'as in the last war,' come to those of my generation with a warning note. Twenty-five years ago we said, as we say to-day, 'Things can never be the same after this ordeal is over. The national life has been purified: class distinctions have lost their edge: in a new, and surely in a lasting, sense we are united.'

What came of this hopeful forecast? It would be untrue to say that none of the lessons of the years 1914 to 1918 was remembered in the decade that followed, for some evils in our social life were lessened and a movement for Christian unity slowly gathered strength. But most of the hopes of the war years gradually faded. In some directions there was a loosening of moral restraints which could be explained, though not justified, as a natural recoil from the long tension of effort and danger; while for a larger number the return to life at home meant that old inhibitions and exclusions resumed their sway. The fellowship of endeavour, which had lasted as long as the external danger filled our minds, sagged and sank with the return of peace, and mere inertia carried us back into our previous narrow circle of friends and interests. This was the easiest course, and above all, we did not want to be troubled.

This sounds a warning to-day, for, greatly as this war differs from the last, these dangers of the spirit are again present. Indeed, just because we have on this occasion come nearer to total war, the weariness at the end may well be more deadening than after the last Armistice. To rebuild a shattered world were a

> Sore task to hearts worn out by many wars
> And eyes grown dim with gazing on the pilot stars.

How, then, if we realize the danger of this moral anti-climax when the war ends, can our nation guard against it more surely than twenty-four years ago? To this question I believe there is no complete political answer; for, if we recognize with wonder the promptitude with which men, for whom their country has apparently done little, rallied to her defence when she was in danger of invasion, we must also recognize that our universal education has not yet trained us as a people to see and guard against the less visible dangers of a time of peace, or to make the sacrifices needed to forestall them. The threat that comes from the air or across the sea in a visible form is met with dauntless courage; but in times of outward security a moral slackness steals on us almost unobserved, which undermines our working power and hinders us from doing our full duty to peoples who have trusted our promises.

But if there is no merely political answer to our problem, there is a religious answer. It was a great democrat, the late Lord Bryce, who said, 'Hitherto civilized society has rested on religion, and . . . free government has prospered best among religious peoples.' If this is true, it shows that faith in God, and a sense of obligation first of all to Him, are the only sure safeguards against those times of slackness and that refusal to face sacrifice which lie in wait at times of outward security. Such faith alone is proof against the failings which beset the natural virtue of the good citizen—lack of staying power, lack of imagination, and a too limited outlook on the field of duty.

It may seem inconsistent to speak of a lack of staying power when I have just emphasized the wonderful endurance and self-forgetfulness shown through months of war by many who have no clear religious faith. Yet three or four years is but a small fraction of a man's life, and still smaller of a nation's; and we are seeking a dynamic that will last as long as life itself, and be proof against the lassitude of the spirit which often approaches when outward tension is relaxed.

We may well recall the divine expostulation in the prophet's words—and some here will seem to hear them, as I do, in the tones of your late Principal's voice—'What can I make of thee?—since your love is like the morning cloud and like

[1] A Murtle Lecture, delivered in King's College Chapel, Aberdeen, somewhat shortened.

the dew so early gone.' But in contrast to this intermittent human virtue stands that of the life dedicated to the service of God, even before the service of country, in a warfare from which there is no discharge. The man or the nation that has recognized as permanent the divine calling and the divine strength is alone armed against the temptation to lay down the oar before the harbour is gained.

Next, lack of imagination. This is shown in the failure to see that creeping and insidious dangers, such as those which threaten family life to-day, may be as deadly as any armed attack. But does religion provide a remedy? A great son of King's College, Alexander Whyte, used to enlarge on 'the religious use of the Imagination'; and, though few can use it as he did, there are two uses open to us all. We may perceive the moral values which lie concealed beneath the surface of everyday life; and we may project ourselves into the circumstances, aspirations, and wrongs of men very different from ourselves. If this were more often done on the international as well as the individual scale, misunderstanding and rivalry, the very roots of war, would be torn up. Thus Paul's words, 'not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others,' have a direct application to inter-racial and international affairs. Nor does he represent this as an exercise of natural virtue: in the passage which follows, he bases it directly on the Christian revelation—'Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus.' Such imagination is pre-eminently a Christian grace.

In claiming that it can bring severed groups of men together as mere civic virtue fails to do, we have also answered the question how we can habitually overcome the narrowness of sympathies restricted by nation and class. A generation ago it was widely assumed that the fact of a common humanity would in itself bind men together across the differences of colour, culture, and economic interest. Some still maintain this hope. In a little book published since the outbreak of war, entitled *Why Freedom Matters*, Sir Norman Angell says, 'In order to survive we democracies must develop enough rationalism to overcome our nationalist prejudices.' Reason, itself a divine gift, may indeed be used much more thoroughly than in the past, and this not least in the attempt to master international problems; but to place the main hope for the redemption of the world in a more widely developed rationalism is to offer a superficial remedy for a disease that has its roots very deep.

Such times as these bring home to us in a hundred ways the explosive force of the powers that separate men and the tragic weakness of the merely human influences that unite them. Human brotherhood can only, for ordinary men, be an operative reality when it is founded on a faith in 'the Father from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named.' Thus, however far off a widespread revival of faith may now seem, we dare not abandon the hope that it will come, though not in the forms familiar in the past; and that it will provide the wide and lasting dynamic which we need now and shall need not less when the war ends.

II.

There is, however, a possible danger in the form of the argument which I have used. It is, I believe, a compelling argument; yet to approach the heart of our subject mainly from the side of social and political need may appear to make religion secondary to politics, and God a mere ally of the statesman. But to do this is the very sum of irreligion. So we must now set over against the argument from human need to its satisfaction in religion the strongest statement that we can frame of the autonomy and supremacy of religious truth.

Statesmen have, indeed, often sought to treat God as an ally, and faith as a useful adjunct to the political tool-chest. But this is to deny one of the most solemn claims of the Bible as a whole. The opening words of Genesis and of the Fourth Gospel, the First Commandment of the Decalogue and the first of Jesus' two Great Commandments, agree in the authoritative note, 'In the beginning, God.' He must stand there or nowhere. As the deepest religious teachers all testify, He must be loved and served, not for reward, nor even as a means to some great ethical end, but for His own sake. Any other service shows a 'false love' (*Theol. Germanica*).

But the very hallmark of the totalitarian system is that it will not, because it cannot afford to, give God this unapproachable place. The State or People has become an absolute, and there is no room for two absolutes in one world-view. Hence the Church, if it is allowed to continue in the totalitarian state, must be tamed, and tied down to such inoffensive functions as the Leader may assign to it. It must be confined to the spiritual sphere; and that sphere is not defined by the Church, or by the Church and State together, but by the State alone. Germany, Russia, Turkey, Japan, all take this line, and it is the only line consistent with their basic ideas of national policy.

Nor is the Church the only sufferer, for all the autonomous activities of the human spirit come under the same ban. In this connexion, the warning of a Roman Catholic layman, Mr. Christopher Dawson, deserves our attention: 'The old individualist ideal of the State as a policeman . . . is a thing of the past. The State of the future will be not a policeman, but a nurse, and a schoolmaster and an employer and an officer—in short, an earthly providence, an all-powerful, omnipotent human

god—and a very jealous god at that' (*Religion and the Modern State*, 106.)

This 'human god,' then, will claim, not only divine or semi-divine honours for itself, but also the right to control art, education, and science—surely a matter of grave concern to all whose work lies in our Universities. But if the Church does not suffer alone in the full-orbed totalitarian state she stands to lose most, since she ministers to the deepest needs of human nature, and the influence of the faith committed to her ought to run through every human activity.

Only a few have the scientist's vocation, and men and women may lead excellent lives with no great appreciation of art; but a life without faith is maimed, while it is the very life-blood of a healthy society that religion within it should be vigorous and free. Such from the human side is the basis of the claim, which rings through all our Scottish history, that the Kirk must be free to do by the light granted to her the work with which she has been entrusted.

This claim to freedom does not, however, define all the Church's relations to the community and the State. In this field, over which so many controversies have ranged and where the conditions of the problem change so often, certain ruling principles can still be discerned. It has been said that between Church and State three conditions should be maintained—Autonomy, Contact, and Respect; and that there are three mistaken attitudes—Statism (known in our own Church History as Erastianism), Separatism, and Ecclesiasticism. The first, of which we see the danger in many lands, leads in the end to the unqualified control of the Church and organized religious life by the dominant political group. The second, 'separatism,' largely prepared the way for this, in Germany at least, by divorcing religion too completely from public action and breaking down the bridge which should lead from the Christianity of the heart to the upbuilding of a Christian society. The remaining error, 'ecclesiasticism,' is least a danger in our day. It has appeared historically in various guises—ultramontanism, theocracy, the 'reign of the saints'; but for the moment the Church is on the defensive and makes no extravagant claims.

If we pass from these false solutions to the three true principles we are still bound to ask, How should the mutual respect of Church and State show itself, how close is their contact to be, and how are the spheres of their respective autonomy to be defined? To these questions there is no final answer, and there has historically been a well-marked oscillation between the tendency to separate strictly the religious and secular spheres, and their close identification or intermingling. In the Middle Ages, in spite of asceticism and monasticism, the Church always claimed the right to lay down rules for every branch of human activity. This remained true in the period of the Reformation. But in the seventeenth century, as Professor Tawney has shown, a new conception of the Church and society gained ground, especially in England and Holland. 'Its essence,' he says, 'is the secularization of social and economic philosophy. The synthesis is resolved into its elements—politics, business, and spiritual exercises; each assumes a separate and independent vitality and obeys the laws of its own being' (*Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, Ch. I.). The earlier tradition died slowly, but from the middle of the eighteenth century till the end of the industrial revolution it was assumed by almost all that religion and economics, like parallel lines, never met; and with this rigid bisection of human life there went the kindred theory that Church and State should each follow its own path, doubtless with mutual respect, but with as little interaction as might be. In particular, the Church must refrain from criticising or in any way embarrassing the temporal power.

Even when this division of the secular and sacred spheres was most widely accepted, voices were raised in protest, not least those of Chalmers in Scotland and the Christian Socialists in the Church of England. The Christian conscience which had long been alert in such matters overseas as the abolition of the slave trade became steadily more uneasy as to social conditions at home. The loss by the Church of her old undivided responsibility for education and the care of the poor, and the widening of the bounds of governmental action, made it clear that the Church must find a new place in the work of the Kingdom of God at home as well as abroad, or retire into a quietism for which she had no longer the warrant of an ascetic theology.

Has the reaction, we may ask, against the individualist separation of the Church and the world gone far enough, or perhaps too far? In some regions I should say definitely, No: for there are circles in which introverted piety is still a danger and the social mission of the Church is very imperfectly grasped. But elsewhere among the Churches of the English-speaking world the greater peril is that the tests of success should be largely external, borrowed too easily from the society amid which the Church moves. The prophetic message, the sense that the sovereign, transcendent God speaks through a body not formed by the will of man—these are characteristics which the Church cannot afford to lose, and which, when they again appear, will make her influence strong even in the secular world.

The apartness of the religious life, and its continuity with the secular—these are the two apparently contrary principles in whose tension the

Church continually dwells, and which each successive age has to harmonize anew. Which aspect is more emphasized will depend on the relative theological emphasis on the transcendence or the immanence of God. On the level of ordinary reasoning, continuity seems to carry the day. We cannot, it is said, 'divide life with a hatchet.' Principles run out into practice, and practice is unstable without a solid foundation in belief. The line of demarcation between the Church's sphere of action and that of secular bodies, official and unofficial, will not 'stay put.' Thus the wisest course is to accept the principle of continuity and cease to draw arbitrary lines between the spiritual and the practical.

Yet there is a deep and widespread instinct in human nature which refuses to accept these arguments as settling the question finally, and holds firmly to the uniqueness and irreducibility of the religious experience. There is, on a less exalted level, an almost equal distrust of the political parson and of the pious politician; nor can this be dismissed as mere prejudice. The common man is right in seeing a distinction between the two spheres —that in which man hears the voice of God speaking of forgiveness and peace as well as duty, and so learns that he is a pilgrim of eternity; and that in which, thus strengthened and equipped, he goes forth to his secular calling in obedience to the heavenly vision. Nor does the attempt simply to combine the two spheres work happily in practice. There have been notable exceptions, but in the main it is true that when churchmen undertake the statesman's task, and when the latter presume to govern the Church, the weaknesses of both stand out more clearly, while their distinctive virtues evaporate. Dante's warning against 'grafting the Sword upon the Crook' still has its significance, though the greater danger to-day is that the Crook may be beaten down by the Sword.

Let me give two illustrations of what I conceive to be the true relation of Church and State. The first arises from a remark by the late Professor Sorley, who had been a member of universities in four different countries, that he considered Old Aberdeen the ideal site for a seat of learning, for it lay near enough to a great city to feel the throb of its busy life, but sufficiently apart to retain its academic atmosphere and relative calm. That may, I suggest, be taken as a symbol of the true relation of the Church to the general community—near enough to feel the stimulus of its manifold activities as well as the challenge of its pressing needs, but far enough away to enable the Church's members to hear the still small voice of God. The human spirit must always pass back and forward between these two attitudes—in this sense there can be no completely unified life—receiving in silence what must be given forth in action. Sometimes the Church will speak as a corporate body, for there are emergencies so pressing and wrongs so flagrant that to keep silence is to betray her trust. More often she will train her members both to speak and act in their secular callings, and not least in their tasks as citizens.

My other illustration is the saying of a man who for years had been prominent and active in public affairs, and who returned to the fellowship of the Church after a long absence from it. He explained his desire to return by saying, 'For long I thought I could make my politics my religion; but I find it won't do, the reservoirs need filling up.' The reservoirs of public service, and the capacity to give it unweariedly in times of stress and perplexity, need filling up. From this point we set out, and to it we have now returned. The Church is the greatest reservoir from which the grace of God flows into human lives. But there are two things to note about reservoirs. They must be placed apart from and above the dwellings and workshops of the community, and the water which gathers in them must then flow freely down to satisfy thirst and furnish power.

To sum up. There is great need to-day for a steady flow of moral energy to carry us through the tremendous tasks and trials of war-time. But this need will not end—it may even increase—when peace returns. It can only be met, adequately and permanently, by a renewal of religious faith; and this must come through a Church which bears a message from God to men. This message carries the mark of authority, and on one side is addressed to the immortal souls of its hearers, but on the other gives them inspiration for their daily lives and secular calling. The Church which brings it must have full freedom to proclaim it; and must act not in subservience to the State, but as a fellow-worker in the cause of righteousness and peace. But in another sense the Church must dwell apart, for, above the conflict there stand those reservoirs of eternal truth from which alone the needs of men, here and hereafter, can be supplied.

Entre Nous.

Herbert Hensley Henson.

Dr. Hensley Henson has made profitable use of the leisure that has come to him since he resigned the See of Durham by writing the story of his life, the first instalment of which has been published under the surprising title: *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life* (Milford; 16s. net). That is the last thing that any one else would say about his life. Nor can we agree with Dr. Henson's own apologia: 'I had been the champion of no cause, the leader of no party, and the darling of no society; I had written no book which had pleased the "reading public"; and, finally, my Journal was as destitute of public interest as of literary merit.' We suspect more than a little of false modesty about all this, for in the fierce controversies, theological and social, that marked the last fifty years or more there was no one in England more prominent as champion of great causes or one about whose personality there gathered such dislike and loyalty, such execration and devotion. The outward events of this varied career can be stated in a few words—his ministry at Bethnal Green, at Barking, at St. Margaret's, Westminster, at Durham as Dean, at Hereford as Bishop, and, finally, as we take leave of this volume, at Durham again as Bishop.

Dr. Henson, the Man. On the jacket of this volume the publishers point out that the autobiography has a double interest, first as self-revelation, and, secondly, as a sidelight on the inner history of the Church of England during a period of great consequence. This true observation may conveniently be used to illustrate some of the salient features of this important book. Nature, Dr. Henson tells us, had endowed him with a sceptical intellect, a sensitive conscience, a considerable power of self-expression in lucid and incisive speech, and a warm heart. Every word in this self-analysis could be repeatedly illustrated from the autobiography. Standing at the altar of Iffley Parish Church he once vowed that 'I would never let considerations of my personal reputation and advantage influence my public course.' And this independence he preserved all through his life. It is an extraordinary thing that only once did he ever consult any one before making up his own mind. With this admirable quality there sometimes went a defiant combativeness which probably irritated his opponents almost as much as his views did. 'I am not the man to yield,' he said in view of some controversy, 'or to be ignored.' He was quite aware that he was the stormy petrel of his day and church. But he always stood for something, even in small matters. On entering the church at Barking on one occasion he was sensible of a strong smell of gas. He asked why it had not been attended to. 'We have had Mr. . . . several times,' he was told, 'but he can't find out where the gas escapes.' 'Is there no other gasfitter in the parish?' the new incumbent asked. 'Yes,' was the reply, 'but he is an atheist and Mr. . . . is an excellent churchman.' 'Well,' said Dr. Henson, 'we want a competent gasfitter for this job, not an incompetent saint. For Heaven's sake send for the atheist.' The atheist came, and the nuisance was ended.

This extreme individualism sometimes became prejudice. No man can be *always* right. And Dr. Henson was no exception. He had certain antipathies among which may be mentioned the Salvation Army, Trade Unions, and Total Abstinence. Of one eminent man he said: 'If the Bishop of Lincoln were not so deeply bitten by all the Radical absurdities, he would be a creditable prelate. But one cannot go far with even the best of men if he be a feminist, a total abstainer, and three parts a pacifist.' His judgment of individuals, indeed, was sometimes severely warped. His unfavourable opinion of General Booth was probably caused by his dislike of the Army. But one member of it got back on him pretty successfully once. 'Captain' Polly had called on the Vicar at Barking on some errand. As she was leaving, she said, 'Do you know, Vicar, what we call you in the Army?' 'I cannot imagine,' he said, 'but I hope nothing very unkind.' 'Oh, no,' she replied, 'we call you Saul the Persecutor, and we pray that you may become Paul the Apostle.' He gives us a list of his opponents which contains most of his prejudices: 'Feminists, Sabbatarians, Total Abstainers, Fundamentalists, Spiritualists, "Corybantic Christians," "Ritualists," Faith-healers' and some others, but the list is fairly comprehensive! He claimed, as we have seen, the gift of incisive speech, and this gift he certainly did possess and exercised publicly and privately. Of the wives of the clergy he said that 'fifty per cent of the married clergy were undone by their wives, and fifty per cent were saved by them.' On one occasion when a friend was criticising his 'gratuitous provocativeness,' Dr. Henson said, 'There are only two things that I am afraid of in the world—*Influenza and Fanaticism.*' What he said about Scotland and the Scots may be quoted for the chastening of the Scot or, alternatively, as an instance of Anglican prejudice! 'There is a streak of absurdity in the Scotch (*sic*) which their very considerable merits cannot wholly conceal. Their national vanity is the more comical, since they really are considerable enough not to need trumpet-blowing.'

Dr. Henson, the Ecclesiastic. This distinguished prelate lived through one of the most controversial periods in modern church history, and he bore himself in the midst of these storms with characteristic honesty, courage and (on the whole) patience. A large part of this volume (in one sense the whole of it) is taken up with the turbulent conflicts of opposing theological and ecclesiastical views. The subjects which divided, and almost rent, the Church of England were Biblical Criticism, Educational Policy, Reunion, Ritualism, and

Christian Socialism, and in every one Dr. Henson played a prominent part. He did not spare his opponents, and perhaps there was an element of 'gratuitous combativeness.' But Dr. Henson's position was always perfectly clear. He was for toleration, for fellowship with all Christians, honesty in church practice, and for the acceptance of ascertained results of criticism. He saw (and said) with remorseless clarity that the real test of the will to unite with other believers was willingness to unite at the Table of the Lord, and that the real bar to re-union was not, in the main, theological but 'inbred divergences of religious taste and habit.' Dr. Henson's 'broad' views on points like the Virgin Birth created a fury of dislike of himself as well as his theology, and the storm that arose when he was nominated to the See of Hereford was almost unprecedented. A large part of the volume is occupied with this episode. Dr. Henson was the object of intense persecution, which failed of its object, but he does not conceal the fact that he has been also the object of just as intense affection and loyalty. No one who appreciates honesty, courage, independence and a high sense of duty will fail to rejoice in the success and devotion which Dr. Henson has reaped in the many fields of his endeavour.

The Catholic Church.

'I cannot any longer pretend to believe in "the Catholic Church." That "exegesis of history" which brought me to love, and, perhaps, trust in, the "Divinely-ordered church," now bids me cast it aside as a mistake. Christianity *is* wider than the Church. Uniformity is *not* unity. Order is *not* "Heaven's first law." Sincerity will conquer at last.

'Yet this is very painful to me: for I *hate* disorder; and the conception of the Church is dear. But it involves too much *shutting one's heart against goodness*: and I positively long to be able to welcome, and cheer on, every bit of goodness in the world.

'How much have I given up? The *priesthood* absolutely. I don't believe in the "Vicar of God" theory. Henceforward no priests, but ministers, presbyters, servants, drawing their authority from the congregation of the "saints." What about the Sacraments? The consecration-prayer theory I resign as unphilosophical, mechanical and even magical.

'"*Ye shall know them by their fruits.*" Apply this to the Ritualist theory of the Sacrament.

'The Eucharist is par excellence *the* means of grace. He who frequently partakes thereof receives extraordinary grace. Necessarily he shows the fact in an extraordinary excellence of conduct. Non-Catholics have no Sacraments, and, therefore, no special grace. They must then be morally inferior to Catholics.

'*But this is obviously not so.* Therefore, either the Sacraments are not means of grace in any unique sense, or they are, and then, non-Catholics have them equally with Catholics.

'The latter must be accepted, for that Sacraments are means of grace is patent; then it is obvious that the Catholic priesthood is no *necessary* attribute of a Church.

'Why should we learn from history for four centuries and then abandon our teacher? History to-day has also her lessons.' [1]

Should the Clergy be Conscripted?

'When, as the conflict developed, it became necessary to make military service compulsory, I regretted that the clergy were left outside its provisions. It seemed to me apparent that, if military service could rightly be required of a layman, it could be no less rightly required of a clergyman, however distinctive might be the specific tasks to which they would be officially assigned. I could never tolerate anything that suggested the existence in Christianity of two standards of morality, one for the Christian layman, and another for the ordained Christian minister. With what consistency could I urge the young workmen of Durham to join the Army, whether as volunteers or as citizens, while I acquiesced in being myself exempted from the obligation to serve?' [2]

The Council of Christians and Jews.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, and the Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire have issued a statement that they are agreed that it would be for the general benefit to form in this country a Council of Christians and Jews.

They realize that in the forefront of their efforts to create division within every community the Nazis have always placed anti-semitism, which is repugnant to the moral principles common to Christianity and Judaism alike. 'We cannot afford,' they say, 'to ignore the effects of the steady propagation of this evil throughout the world. It is not only a menace to the unity of every community in which it takes root, but it is the very negation of those values on which alone we believe that a new and better world can be established.'

The aims of the Council are:

(*a*) To check and combat religious and racial intolerance.

(*b*) To promote mutual understanding and goodwill between Christians and Jews in all sections of the community, especially in connexion with problems arising from conditions created by the war.

(*c*) To promote fellowship between Christian and Jewish youth organizations in educational and cultural activities.

[1] H. H. Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, i. 21.

[2] *Ib.*, 175.

(*d*) To foster co-operation of Christians and Jews in study and service directed to post-war reconstruction.

Inquiries should be addressed to the Hon. Secretaries, the Council of Christians and Jews, 21 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C. 1.

Discernment.

'In every department of human life progress takes place only through discernment, through new discovery of fact, new apprehension of truth. The fact had always been a fact, the truth a truth; but we had not been aware of it. Then our eyes were opened, and seeing a bigger world we had the opportunity at least to become bigger people. Of every step forward, whether in public or in private affairs, these words might be used: 'and there fell from my eyes as it had been scales,' or 'whereas I was blind, now I see.'

'This is so obviously true of science and of its relation to our life, that it needs no illustration. The whole enterprise of science is the discovery of new truth. But it is also true, if less obviously so, of art. The great artists are those who not only improve the technique of painting, but also perceive new colour-tones, new beauties, such as nobody has perceived before. It was the eye of some discerning painter which first perceived the violet colouring in the bare woods of late autumn; hitherto they had always been seen and reproduced as merely brown. It was the Barbizon school of painters, we are told, which first noticed and transferred to the canvas the intense blue which lies in the shadow of a furrow in the wintertime. It is the supreme function of the artist, indeed, to give us eyes, to make us see, to quicken discernment.

'And certainly the same thing is true in the sphere of the moral life. The history of progress in this sphere is the history of increasing discernment and sensitivity in the matter of personal relationships. The great moral pioneers have all been those who have suddenly awakened to the fact that what everybody has hitherto taken to be necessary and right is really wrong and ought not to be. No one can read the social history of this country without being continually astounded and depressed that it could ever have been possible for so many apparently genuine people not to *see* that certain iniquities were iniquities.' [1]

Grey Eminence.

Aldous Huxley in his *Grey Eminence* has much to say of temptation. He is presenting the life story of a Frenchman of high rank, François Leclerc du Tremblay, who in 1600 became a Capuchin friar known as Father Joseph. Here was a man who cared naught for money nor yet for fame and position. But he was inveigled into the slippery, devious paths of power politics as companion and adviser of Richelieu, becoming implicated in the falsehood and pandering to base passions incident in those days to such a career. How was this achieved? Not by the ordinary temptations of a Miltonic Satan. 'Father Joseph was diverted from the road of mystical perfection by a set of related temptations—the temptation to do what seemed to be his duty, to accomplish what was apparently the external will of God, the temptation to be mistaken about God's will and to choose a lower at the expense of a higher duty; and the temptation to believe that a disagreeable task must be good just because it was disagreeable.' As novelist turned historian, Huxley works out in unusual fashion this thesis and shows himself a keen student of the vulnerability even of the saintly. From an unexpected angle one may find here much food for thought.

[1] H. H. Farmer, in *The Christian World*, September 17, 1942.

Magnet Bill.

One of the great American automobile firms, now probably making munitions of war, has on its staff a man bent with age, who wanders about the works all day, and does not look like one of the most important persons about the place. Actually he is, and according to the president of the company, he saves it every day more than a dozen times his wages. All day long he wanders where he will about the workshops and roadways, his eyes almost always on the ground, and the other employees call him 'Magnet Bill,' because his only tool is a large magnet at the end of a long handle.

It is his duty to remove from the roadways every nail and bit of iron or other metal that might puncture a tyre, and it is reckoned that without the work done by Magnet Bill in removing dangerous objects from the tracks the annual bill for cut and punctured tyres would be well over twenty thousand dollars. It pays in business to remove all possible causes of trouble and danger, and in other realms it pays still more. I need not say in what realms, but I may remind you that we are all called to be Magnet Bills, and to spend at least some of our time in obeying the command: 'Take up the stumbling block in the path of my people.' [2]

[2] Ezra, in *The Methodist Recorder*, September 17, 1942.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.